The Future of Technology Education in the ‘Low Lands’
Experts’ Views in Flanders and the Netherlands

Ardies, Jan; de Vries, M.J.

Publication date
2022

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
PATT 39 On the Edge Proceedings

PATT 39

ON THE EDGE

TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION & EDUCATION

PROCEEDINGS

DESIGNING A BETTER *WORLD* THROUGH TECHNOLOGICAL LITERACY *FOR ALL*

June 21 – 24, 2022
Memorial University,
St. John's, NL, Canada

Editors:
David Gill, Jim Tuff, Thomas Kennedy, Shawn Pendergast and **Sana Jamil**

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
MARINE INSTITUTE
PATT
100 years of excellence
FACULTY OF EDUCATION MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
Newfoundland Labrador CANADA
Newfoundland & Labrador English School District
CONSEIL SCOLAIRE FRANCOPHONE PROVINCIAL

PATT 39

PATT on the Edge

Technology, Innovation and Education

St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada

June 21st-24th, 2022

Edited by:

Dr. David Gill
Memorial University
Mr. Jim Tuff
Memorial University
Dr. Thomas Kennedy
Memorial University
Dr. Shawn Pendergast
Memorial University
Ms. Sana Jamil
Memorial University

Faculty of Education
Memorial University of Newfoundland

ISBN: 978-0-88901-505-0

The Future of Technology Education in the 'Low Lands': Experts' Views in Flanders and the Netherlands

Jan Ardies[1*], Marc J. De Vries[2]

[1]AP University of Applied Sciences and Arts, Department of Education and Training, Antwerp, Belgium

[2]Delft University of Technology Faculty of Applied Sciences

[*]Correspondence: Jan.ardies@ap.be

Abstract

In 2020 an article about USA experts' opinions on the future of technology education was published. Several concerns were expressed by the experts in the Delphi study that had been conducted, such as a shortage of teachers and funding. From the start of the study in USA the idea was to conduct similar studies in other countries. In Finland such a study has also been done but the outcomes have not been published yet. It is interesting to see to what extent the outcomes are USA specific or more broadly valid. To find that out a similar study was done also in Flanders (the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium) and the Netherlands. It became clear that there are similarities between the USA outcomes but also differences. Most of those differences can be explained by taking into account the local developments in the different countries.

Key Words Delphi study, impact factors, expectations for technology education.

1. INTRODUCTION

The position of Technology Education in de school curriculum still today is not to be taken for granted. Although good practices are available in various countries, there is still confusion among school boards, parents and policy makers about the purpose, focus and content of technology education. The historical craft tradition out of which technology education emerged in most countries still lingers around in discussion about how to teach about technology in school. Adding the term 'engineering' to 'technology education, as was done in the USA (in the name of the main teacher association this led to the change from 'International Technology Education Association' into 'International Technology and Engineering Education Association') was an effort to show that technology education had left its craft past behind. In other countries there is hesitation to add that term to the name of subject and association because of the vocational 'flavor' that sometimes comes along with the term 'engineering'. The developments towards STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) education has added to the confusion, as this acronym and the educational developments associated with it, raise the question of how technology is related to science and math and what the term engineering means in the context of a situation in which engineering is not a school subject like science and math.

All together the future of technology education is not easily predictable. Yet, it can be worthwhile to ask selected experts what their ideas about this are. This was done in a Delphi study conducted in the USA and reported by Johnny Moye, Philip A. Reed, Ray Wu-Rorre and Douglas Lecorchick (Moye, Reed, Wu-Rorrer and Lecorchick 2020). Their study was not a standard Delphi study in which a selected group of about 25-30 experts respond to outcomes of the previous round so that in (usually) three rounds a consensus can be established. Instead, two hundred sixty-eight participants were in involved in the third and final round of the USA study. The similarity with the traditional Delphi set-up outcomes of one round were fed back int the next so that respondents could change their opinions based on the averages found of the previous round (which eventually leads to consensus). The main outcomes of the USA study were that respondent expressed concerns about the lack of technology teachers and the lack of funding for programs. The identity and perceived relevance of technology education also was a reason for concern as was the quality of teacher preparation. A positive outcome was the increase attention of student inclusion and equity. In the discussion of the outcomes, the authors show how the outcomes can be understood in terms of actual developments in the country.

This raises the question as to what extent the outcomes of the USA study are specific for this country and to what extent they are more broadly valid. From the very start of the USA study, the idea was to conduct similar studies in other countries. In Finland, a study was done by Sonja Niiranen (2021) and others. In the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium (Flanders) and in the Netherlands, the historical development of technology education is different. That makes it worthwhile to do another similar study there.

2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION IN FLANDERS AND THE NETHERLANDS

2.1. Flanders

In 2004 the TOS21 working group was started up from the Departments of Education and Science of the Flemish government. TOS21 stands for Technology at School in the 21st century and must work on a sound development of technical education with the development of concrete attainment targets for primary and secondary education (Moens, 2008). However, the major objective, remains to make young people enthusiastic about technology. From 1 September 2010, the subject 'Technological education' was replaced by the subject ‘Technique’ (‘Techniek’, in Flemish, which has a different connotation than Technology). Characteristic of the subject 'Technique' is that this time it is about 'Technical literacy for everyone', starting in kindergarten (2.5-year-olds) and continuing until the end of secondary education (18-year-olds). In 2014, the renewal of secondary education is once again on the agenda. Ardies and Boeve De Pauw (2014) propose a two-track policy with regard to technology in education. The first is a socially motivated perspective for broad technical literacy, based on the idea that every citizen should be able to participate optimally in society. The second, more economically inspired track is the demand from the labor market for sufficient technically skilled workers. In 2015, the Flemish government formulates a STEM framework for Flemish education. This is partly the base for the new educational goals for secondary education, which started in the scholastic year 2019-2020. In these educational goals we no longer find separate goals for technology, they are now integrated in STEM. Although with its own frames of reference. Anno 2022, technology will retain its place in the curriculum with 2 hours a week in the first two years of secondary education. In primary school, technology is no longer in the subject ‘World Orientation’, but in the less broad subject ‘Science and Technology’.

2.2. The Netherlands

In the Netherlands, technology education was introduced as a separate school subject in lower secondary education (pupil ages 12-15 years) in 1993. In-service education programs were set up to re-educate teachers of other subjects to become technology teachers. Later the government initiated a national program for primary teachers also, but left it to primary schools whether or not they would implement technology education or not. Only some fairly superficial standards were formulated and these did not have much impact on what happened in schools. For upper secondary school, it was decided to have technological elements in the exam syllabi for physics, chemistry and biology. In 2000 school were also given the option to integrate technology education in science education, and many school did this. In the 2010s a new type of school was developed called Technasium schools and they had a subject ‘Researching and Designing’ (in Dutch: Onderzoeken en Ontwerpen, abbreviated O&O) that often was implemented not next to but instead of technology education. Around the same time for upper secondary a new (elective) school subject called Nature, Life and Technology (abbreviated NLT) was initiated. This subject can truly be called integrated STEM and several of the modules that are taught have design assignments. The current situation is that the number of schools still having a separate subject technology education in lower secondary school is much lower than before but stable and in upper secondary education technology education is part of science education (in the exam syllabi and in the subject NLT). In primary education there is a still increasing number of schools taking up technology education and teachers are supported by regional so-called science-and-technology hubs. The most recent development is called Curriculum.nu. It entails a complete revision of the curriculum for primary and secondary education. New standards have been formulated for nine ‘learning areas’, one of which is called ‘Humans and Nature’. Science and technology education standards can be found here. The idea is that schools can decide how to organise the curriculum, but it is stimulated that boundaries between the existing school subjects are made more porous. It is not quite clear what will become of this initiative as at the moment it is still in political debate.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research questions

In the Low Lands study we used the following research questions:

1a. What currently has a positive impact on science and technology education?
1b. What currently has a negative impact on science and technology education?
2a. What trends will most likely impact the Technology and Engineering Education profession in the next three to five years in a positive way?
2b. What trends will most likely impact the Technology and Engineering Education profession in the next three to five years in a negative way?
3a. what new topics will become part of technology education?
3b. what topics will disappear from technology education?

It can be read from the questions that we used a term similar to STEM but more common for our experts, rather than ‘technology education’. This made it more recognizable particularly for the experts involved in primary education.

3.2. Methodology

In the first round, the experts formulated trends and topics in their own words. These were combined and fed back in the second in the order of the number of times they had been mentioned in the first round. In the second round, the experts were given the opportunity to change the order of the trends and topics based on the average order of the first round that was presented to them in the second round. The revised order was then again presented for revision to them in the third round after which sufficient consensus was established (a score was given to each trend and topic according to the order in which it appeared in the list and it was considered to be sufficient consensus when the interquartile range – the spread of the middle 50% of the scores - was 3 or less because this means that the upper and lower score round the median - the value separating the higher half from the lower half of the scores - differs less than two places in the order of importance; here we followed the indications used by Heiko, 2012). The fact that consensus was reached even though the experts were from two countries shows that our impression that the two countries show comparable developments was correct.

Contrary to the USA study we did not submit the questions to a large number of respondents as in a survey, but to a small number of selected experts, as in most Delphi studies. The group of experts was a mix of teachers, teacher educators, pedagogical supporters, and policy makers. All of the experts are in the field of technology education, but for primary education science education and technology education are not separate subjects. Some of the experts for secondary education had a background in science education also. In that sense, the experts often also connect to STEM. There was also a spread of experts over primary and secondary education.

Table 9. Numbers of respondents

Respondents	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
The Netherlands	11	4	2
Flanders	17	9	5
Teachers	8	2	1
Teacher educators	11	6	3
Pedagogical support	4	2	1
Policy makers	4	2	2
Unknown	1	1	
Total	28	13	7

From the Table it can be seen that the number of respondents dropped dramatically with each round. This means that we can be fairly confident in the content of the factors that were mentioned but less of the status of the consensus. Statistically it is a consensus indeed but with a very low number of respondents left over.

4. RESULTS

First in this section the outcomes for each of the six research questions will be presented briefly (in terms of lists of most important factors and topics) and then in the conclusion and discussion session we will build the overall picture of what the experts have brought forward.
In Table 2 the outcomes of the six research questions have been combined to get an overview of all factors and topics brought forward by the experts.

Table 2. Factors and impacts combined

	Positive (Factor)/increasing (topic)	Negative (factor)/decreasing (topic)
Current impact factor	1. enthusiasm of technology teachers. 2. increasing attention for inquiry- and design-based learning. 3. the new national STEM standards.	1. lack of knowledge and skills of teachers. 2. negative image of technology education at schools. 3. little or no focus on STEM in primary education. 4. Little cooperation between subjects resulting in isolated position of technology teacher.

Future impact factor	1. Better teacher education for technology teachers. 2. The introduction of STEM-specialised teachers. 3. Cooperation with knowledge institutes. 4. A new vision on STEM by the government (more integrated education). 5. Modernization of the curriculum with STEM as a key competence.	1. Time pressure for technology teachers 2. Fragmentation of STEM subjects 3. Uncontrolled labelling of activities as 'STEM'
Topic in curriculum	1. Project-based and explorative activities with practical relevance 2. Iterative design cycles with increasing complexity 3. More multidisciplinary and integrated STEM education 4. ICT-related topics (AI, VR, robotics and programming) 5. Sustainability, environment and climate 6. (less prominent in the list) Health	1. Design work and classroom experiments with a fixed sequence of steps without explanation of the rationale for these steps 2. Contextless and abstract teaching 3. Tinkering and craft

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 suggest that there are three main issues to which the experts refer: teachers and curriculum.
On the one hand, the enthusiasm of teachers is seen as the most positive impact factor for technology education. On the other hand, the fact that there is a shortage and that the teacher there are lack knowledge and skills is a serious threat for technology education. Also the fact that there is a time pressure on teachers is problematic. For the future the experts have high expectation of the emergence of new teachers that are have been trained as specialized STEM teachers.

The second issue is the status of technology education. Experts expressed their concern that this status is still low, in spite of all the efforts made in the past decades to develop a fully up-to-date subject in which making is no longer the most important activity, but designing and the social aspects of technology also are important elements of the curriculum. This image does not get better of course when, e.g., the government put the label 'STEM' on all sorts of activities without distinguishing between high quality teaching and activities that are of inferior quality. For the future the experts see hope in the expectation that the role of tinkering and craft will be further diminished and the curriculum will be more in line with other STEM subjects (more contextualized, more 'trendy' topics like sustainability and ICT).

That brings us to the third issue, namely the curriculum. The experts are concerned about the fact that the position of technology education in the school curriculum is weak in certain respects. In the first place it does not have a good presence in primary education. Furthermore, it is often isolated which means that technology education does not gain from the higher status of other STEM subjects (particularly science education). For the future the experts have expectation of the new vision on STEM as promoted by government. If the idea is to have better connections between the STEM subjects, this will give technology education a better position. That, combined with the increased role of contemporary topics like sustainability and ICT will likely improve the position of technology in the school curriculum.

For the Netherlands these outcomes can be understood in the context of the Curriculum.nu process that was described in section 1. From the start of that process the position of technology was a concern and there was even a special committee to provide directions to the development teams for each of the learning areas as to how to include elements of technology in the standards they were about to develop. The end products of the development teams clearly contained traces of efforts to do justice to the role of technology in that learning area. As for the concern about teachers, for the Netherlands there certainly is a shortage, although more prominently for science than for technology. New teacher education programs have been initiated for integrated STEM subjects like O&O (Researching and Designing) and NLT (Nature, Life and Technology). A first effect is already visible in that the new teachers coming out of such programs are strongly welcomed by Technasium schools and given high responsibilities in setting up curricula for O&O.

In Flanders technology education was never a point of discussion the last years. A broad consensus remains that technology must have a place in the curriculum from the age of 2.5 till 18. Nevertheless, when looking at how it is placed in the curricula of primary and secondary education there is a shift. In primary education technology education gained some prominence as it was before part of the lessons under the umbrella of ‘world orientation’, and since 2010 this subject is split up in ‘Human and Society’ and ‘Science and Technology’. By doing so technology became more visible in the primary curricula. Primary teachers often still struggle with the content, and despite their enthusiasm we experience a large need for workshops, and the development of knowledge and skills in technology.

In secondary education however Flanders is currently in transition to a new structure and goals. STEM becomes more prominent as it is one of the 8 domains students can choose. Technology however is isn’t a main subject in this domain, the focus in more theoretical studies is often on science, mathematics. In labour market-oriented studies, we find the development of skills in electricity, mechanics, etc. A real theoretical study that (also) focusses on technology or engineering in the higher grades of secondary education is lacking. In the first year of secondary education the subject technology remains present although it is difficult to find qualified teachers. The number of students in teacher training that choose technology education as a main subject is diminishing year by year.

It is also interesting to compare the results of the ‘Low Lands’ study with the previous USA study. A clear communality is the concern about teachers, both in terms of availability and preparation in teacher education. The study in the USA did not mention the quality of teachers themselves. It would be to easy to conclude that USA teachers are better than teachers in the Netherlands and Flanders, particularly because for both contexts the quality of teacher education was mentioned as a reason for concern. The status of technology education is another common concern for the two contexts. Technology education is still not acknowledged as a subject of high relevance, probably due to its history in craft. A difference between the two contexts is that funding is not mentioned as a reason for concern in the ‘Low Lands’ whereas it was mentioned as a reason for concern in the USA. Probably this can be explained by the fact that in the past the government has provided a fair budget for schools to set up a technology education classroom with good equipment. Teachers gets an annual budget per pupil to purchase materials and replacement tools. The positive expectations expressed in the USA study concerning increased attention for inclusion and equity are absent in the ‘Low Lands’ study. This can be explained by the fact that the ‘Low Lands’ generally speaking have a stronger multicultural tradition than the USA (race segregation, for instance, only belong to a period far back in history) and a stronger social tendency for acceptance of alternative gender identities compared to the more traditional ones.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Both the USA and the ‘Low Lands’ study have shown that a consultation of experts on the present and future of technology education as an element of STEM yields results that can be well interpreted from the national contexts of the studies. Both studies show that there are serious concerns for the future but also that there are opportunities to safeguard the future of technology education in the context of STEM. Both studies show that a better connection of technology education with the other STEM subjects can enhance the position of technology education in the curriculum. Teachers, however, are always a crucial factor and the availability and education of them is a continuing concern.

7. REFERENCES

Ardies, J., & Boeve-de Pauw, J. (2014). Techniek in het onderwijs: een tweesporenbeleid. In Het onderwijsdebat/Nicaise, Ides [edit.]; ea (pp. 43-69).

Heiko, A. V. D. G. (2012). Consensus measurement in Delphi studies: review and implications for future quality assurance. Technological forecasting and social change, 79(8), 1525-1536.

Moens, G. (2008). TOS21 Technische Geletterdheid voor Iedereen (E. Onderwijs & Vorming, Weteschap en Innovatie, Trans.). Brussel: Vlaamse Overheid.

Moye, J. J., Reed, P. A., Wu-Rorrer, R., & Lecorchick, D. (2020). Current and future trends and issues facing technology and engineering education in the United States. Journal of Technology Education, 32(1).

Niiranen, S., Rasinen, A., Rissanen, T., & Ikonen, P. (2021). Identifying past and current trends in technology education in Finland. Techne series, 28(2).