

**The technological knowledge used by technology
education students in capability tasks**

by

Willem Rauscher

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Philosophiae Doctor

in

Curriculum Studies

Faculty of Education

University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Professor Dr A. Hattingh

March 2009

Abstract

The inception of technology education as a learning area in the South African national curriculum has posed challenges different from those in the other learning areas. Technology education is, compared to subjects such as mathematics and science, still a fairly new subject both nationally and internationally. As a result technology education does not have a large research base or established subject philosophy. This can lead to problems in understanding the nature of technology and other pedagogical problems, such as the fragmentation of curricula in which content is simply parcelled in 'departments'.

One way through which technology can be conceptualized and understood is through *technology as knowledge* (epistemology). In the absence of an established subject philosophy for technology education, one can draw on frameworks from other disciplines in the field, such as engineering and design practice, for insights into technological knowledge. Educators, however, still need to determine the usefulness of these frameworks to technology education.

The purpose of this study therefore, is to investigate the usefulness of an epistemological framework chiefly derived from engineering to be able to describe the nature of technological knowledge, in an attempt to contribute towards the understanding of this relatively new learning area. The conceptual framework for this study was derived mainly from Vincenti's (1990) categories of knowledge and knowledge-generating activities based on his research into historical aeronautic engineering cases.

A combination of quantitative and qualitative research was used to provide insight into the categories of knowledge and knowledge-generating activities used by students at the University of Pretoria during capability tasks. This included an analysis of the questionnaire (quantitative data), which was administered to and completed by the students, as well as a content analysis (qualitative data) of the students' project portfolios.

Findings from this study suggest that the conceptual framework chiefly derived from and used by professional engineers is useful in technology education. The findings also suggest that both the categories of technological knowledge and the knowledge-

generating activities apply to all the content areas, i.e. structures, systems and control, and processing, in technology education.

The study recommends that researchers and educators deepen their understanding of the nature of technological knowledge by considering the categories of technological knowledge and the knowledge-generating activities presented in the conceptual framework. In order to “operationalise” the conceptual framework, educators must consciously attempt to include items of knowledge from each category of knowledge when conceptualising capability tasks for their learning programmes. The framework can then be used as a matrix to evaluate their learning programmes to ensure that all knowledge items (categories and activities) are addressed in each capability task in the technology learning programmes.

Keywords:

categories of technological knowledge
collaborative and cooperative learning
contemporary views of learning
knowledge
knowledge-generating activities
project- and problem-based learning
science and technology
technological knowledge
technology
technology education
transfer of knowledge

Table of contents

Abstract	ii
Table of contents	iv
List of tables	xi
List of figures	xii
List of graphs	xiii
Chapter 1 Prelude to the enquiry	
1.1 Overview of the chapter	1
1.2 Introduction	1
1.3 Background, rationale and purpose	1
1.4 Research questions	4
1.5 Explanation of key terms	5
1.5.1 The term technology	5
1.5.2 The use of the term <i>technology</i>	5
1.5.2.1 Engineering	5
1.5.2.2 Social science	6
1.5.2.3 The use of the term <i>technology</i> in this study	5
1.5.3 The design process	6
1.5.4 The project portfolio	6
1.5.5 Technological activities	7
1.5.5.1 Capability tasks	7
1.5.5.2 Resource tasks	7
1.5.5.3 Case studies	7
1.5.6 Project- and problem-based learning	7

1.5.7	Collaborative and cooperative learning	9
1.5.8	Constructivism and social constructivism	10
1.6	Context of the study	10
1.6.1	JOT 353	13
1.6.2	JOT 354	13
1.7	Research design and methodology	14
1.8	Research limitations	15
1.9	Outline and organisation of the study	16
Chapter 2 Literature review		
2.1	Overview of the chapter	17
2.2	Knowledge	17
2.2.1	Definitions of knowledge	18
2.2.2	Technological knowledge	20
2.3	Science and technology	22
2.4	Knowledge and learning	24
2.4.1	Contemporary views of learning	25
2.4.2	Transfer of knowledge	26
2.5	Frameworks of knowledge in technology	27
2.5.1	Vincenti's framework	28
2.5.2	Ropohl's framework	33
2.5.3	De Vries's framework	34
2.5.4	Bayazit's framework	36
2.6	Summary	37

Chapter 3 Research design and methodology

3.1	Overview of the chapter	40
3.2	Strategy of inquiry	40
3.3	Philosophical assumption	41
3.4	Conceptual framework	42
3.4.1	Motivation for using the conceptual framework	43
3.4.2	Limitations of the conceptual framework	43
3.4.3	The need to extend the meaning of theoretical engineering research as a knowledge-generating activity	43
3.5	Target population	45
3.6	Contextual background	46
3.6.1	Module JOT 353	47
3.6.2	Module JOT 354	49
3.7	Sampling	53
3.7.1	Quantitative phase	53
3.7.2	Qualitative phase	53
3.8	Instruments, reliability and validity	54
3.8.1	Quantitative phase	54
3.8.1.1	Reliability (consistency)	55
3.8.1.2	Internal validity (truth value)	55
3.8.1.3	External validity (generalizability)	56
3.8.1.4	Objectivity (neutrality)	56
3.8.2	Qualitative phase	56
3.8.2.1	Dependability (reliability)	57
3.8.2.2	Credibility (internal validity)	57
3.8.2.3	Transferability (external validity)	58

3.8.2.4	Confirmability (objectivity)	58
3.9	Procedures of data collection and analysis	58
3.9.1	Quantitative phase	58
3.9.2	Qualitative phase	59
Chapter 4 Data and results of the quantitative phase		
4.1	Overview of the chapter	60
4.2	Categories of technological knowledge	60
4.2.1	Fundamental design concepts	65
4.2.2	Criteria and specifications	66
4.2.3	Theoretical tools	68
4.2.4	Quantitative data	69
4.2.4.1	Quantitative data: descriptive knowledge	70
4.2.4.2	Quantitative data: prescriptive knowledge	71
4.2.5	Practical considerations	72
4.2.6	Design instrumentalities	73
4.2.7	Socio-technological understanding	74
4.2.8	Collaborative design knowledge	76
4.2.9	Relationship between the extent to which students made use of the categories of technological knowledge in the two content areas	77
4.3	Knowledge-generating activities	79
4.3.1	Transfer from science	83
4.3.2	Invention	85
4.3.3	Theoretical engineering research	88
4.3.4	Experimental engineering research	91
4.3.5	Design practice	94
4.3.6	Production	96

4.3.7	Direct trial	98
4.3.8	Relationship in the knowledge-generating activities between the two content areas	101
4.4	Conclusion	102
Chapter 5 Data and results of the qualitative phase		
5.1	Overview of the chapter	104
5.2	Categories of technological knowledge	104
5.2.1	Fundamental design concepts	105
5.2.1.1	Theoretical engineering research	106
5.2.1.2	Experimental engineering research	107
5.2.1.3	Direct trial	110
5.2.2	Criteria and specifications	111
5.2.2.1	Theoretical engineering research	111
5.2.2.2	Experimental engineering research	114
5.2.2.3	Design practice	115
5.2.2.4	Direct trial	116
5.2.3	Theoretical tools	117
5.2.3.1	Transfer from science	118
5.2.3.2	Theoretical engineering research	119
5.2.3.3	Design practice	119
5.2.3.4	Direct trial	121
5.2.4	Quantitative data	122
5.2.4.1	Theoretical engineering research	124
5.2.4.2	Experimental engineering research	124
5.2.5	Practical considerations	125
5.2.5.1	Design practice	125



5.2.5.2	Production	126
5.2.5.3	Direct trial	127
5.2.6	Design instrumentalities	128
5.2.6.1	Theoretical engineering research	128
5.2.6.2	Experimental engineering research	128
5.2.6.3	Design practice	130
5.2.6.4	Production	131
5.2.6.5	Direct trial	132
5.2.7	Socio-technological understanding	133
5.2.7.1	Theoretical engineering research	134
5.2.7.2	Experimental engineering research	135
5.2.7.3	Design practice	135
5.2.7.4	Direct trial	136
5.2.8	Collaborative design knowledge	136
5.3	Conclusion	137
Chapter 6 Epilogue		
6.1	Overview of the chapter	140
6.2	Overview of the study	140
6.3	Revisiting the research questions	142
6.3.1	Sub-question 1	142
6.3.2	Sub-question 2	145
6.3.3	Sub-question 3	148
6.3.4	Sub-question 4	149
6.3.5	The main research question	150
6.4	Reflection	153



6.5	Recommendations	154
6.5.1	Recommendations for technology educators and policy makers	154
6.5.2	Recommendations for further research	155
	Bibliography	157
	Appendix	163

List of tables

Table 1	Differences between project-based and problem-based learning	8
Table 2	Design and technology course structure	11
Table 3	Outline and organisation of the study	16
Table 4	Vincenti's summary of knowledge categories and knowledge-generating activities	32
Table 5	Conceptual framework	42
Table 6	Number of student responses to each category of technological knowledge relevant to the educational toy	61
Table 7	Number of student responses to each category of technological knowledge relevant to the structures artefact	63
Table 8	The relationship between the two content areas of student engagement in the categories of technological knowledge	78
Table 9	Estimates for weak, moderate and strong correlation coefficients	78
Table 10	Number of student responses to each knowledge-generating activity relevant to the educational toy	79
Table 11	Number of student responses to each knowledge-generating activity relevant to the structures artefact	81
Table 12	Sources consulted by the students during the theoretical research for the educational toy	90
Table 13	Sources consulted by the students during the theoretical research for the structural artefact	90
Table 14	The relationship between the two content areas	101
Table 15	An example of criteria presented in the evaluation rubric	133
Table 16	Items of knowledge that differed from those in Vincenti's matrix	138

List of figures

Figure 1	Strategy of inquiry	40
Figure 2	Educational toy 1	48
Figure 3	Educational toy 2	48
Figure 4	Educational toy 3	49
Figure 5	Structure 1	51
Figure 6	Structure 2	51
Figure 7	Structure 3	51
Figure 8	Structure 4	51
Figure 9	Annotated sketch showing a possible solution using a gear system	108
Figure 10	Annotated sketch showing a possible solution using a pulley system	109
Figure 11	Light emitting diode (LED) circuit diagram	113
Figure 12	Circuit diagram depicting the value of the resistors in series with the LED	114
Figure 13	Sketches with design calculations	116
Figure 14	Flat drawing showing quantitative dimensions	123
Figure 15	Sketches depicting visual thinking	130
Figure 16	Extract of the manufacturing sequence in the making of an educational toy	132

List of graphs

Graph 1	Number of student responses to the categories of technological knowledge applicable to the educational toy	61
Graph 2	Number of student responses to the categories of technological knowledge applicable to the structures artefact	63
Graph 3	Fundamental design concepts – comparison between the two content areas	65
Graph 4	Criteria and specifications – comparison between the two content areas	67
Graph 5	Theoretical tools – comparison between the two content areas	68
Graph 6	Quantitative data: descriptive knowledge – comparison between the two content areas	70
Graph 7	Quantitative data: prescriptive knowledge – comparison between the two content areas	71
Graph 8	Practical considerations – comparison between the two content areas	72
Graph 9	Design instrumentalities – comparison between the two content areas	73
Graph 10	Socio-technological understanding – comparison between the two content areas	75
Graph 11	Collaborative design knowledge – comparison between the two content areas	76
Graph 12	Number of student responses to the knowledge-generating activities relevant to the educational toy	80
Graph 13	Number of student responses to the knowledge-generating activities relevant to the structures artefact	82
Graph 14	Transfer from science – comparison between the two content areas	84
Graph 15	Invention – comparison between the two content areas	86
Graph 16	Theoretical engineering research – comparison between the two content areas	89
Graph 17	Experimental research – comparison between the two content areas	92
Graph 18	Design practice – comparison between the two content areas	94



Graph 19	Production – comparison between the two content areas	96
Graph 20	Direct trial ¹ – comparison between the two content areas	99
Graph 21	Direct trial ² – comparison between the two content areas	100