

Part II
Ideologies of Engineering Education

Introduction

Brent K. Jesiek and Christelle Didier

Questions about the ideological underpinnings of engineering are not new, as evidenced by the efforts of a handful of pioneering historians and sociologists who dared tackle the topic. Edwin Layton's classic *The Revolt of the Engineers* (Layton 1971), for example, showed how the professional ideals and aspirations embraced by many American engineers during the Progressive Era stood in marked tension with business imperatives and bureaucratic loyalty – and with the latter ultimately prevailing. Covering similar historical and conceptual territory but more Marxist in outlook, David Noble's *America by Design* (1979) portrayed a growing alignment of the U.S. engineering profession with market capitalism and an almost mystical ideology of quasi-autonomous technology. Both works helped contextualize the profession's development in America from the late nineteenth to mid-twentieth century and demonstrated how prevailing engineering values and attitudes were frequently interchangeable with a business ethos that was inculcated through dominant pathways of education and career development.

Still other works have helped show how partially unique configurations of ideology and engineering have emerged in other national and cultural contexts, as reflected in Ken Alder's argument that the early modern history of the engineering profession in France was “energized by a radical ideology that justified social hierarchy by reference to national service” (Alder 1999, p. xii). A growing body of cross-national comparative research by scholars such as Gary Downey and Juan

B.K. Jesiek (✉)

School of Engineering Education, Purdue University,
701 West Stadium Avenue, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA
e-mail: bjesiek@purdue.edu

C. Didier

Département des sciences de l'éducation UFR DECCID,
Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille3,
3 Rue du Barreau, Villeneuve-d'Ascq, Lille F-59650, France
e-mail: christelle.didier@univ-lille3.fr

Lucena has also more broadly shown how engineers respond to – while to some degree shaping – prevalent meanings, such as dominant understandings of what counts as national progress, or what it means for engineers to serve government and/or private industry (Downey and Lucena 2004; Downey et al. 2007). As these works make clear, the ideological commitments of engineers and engineering not only profoundly inflect what it means to be an engineer or practice engineering; such commitments may also vary considerably by time and place.

The chapters in this part continue and extend these traditions of scholarship. They do so by reminding us of many important, recurring questions about how the ideological foundations of engineering as a modern discipline and profession resonate (or, perhaps just as importantly – may fail to resonate) with other prevalent beliefs and values – whether economic, technological, political, social, cultural, or otherwise. Qin Zhu and Brent Jesiek’s Chap. 7, for example, looks to China as an underexplored yet increasingly important context for investigating the ideology-engineering nexus. More specifically, the authors identify three relevant ideological currents that can enable a better understanding of the intellectual context of engineering in China: Confucianism, Marxism, and economic pragmatism. Starting from three questions that are traditionally raised in studies of engineering ethics and professionalism by U.S. scholars (and which often take a Parsonian-functionalist approach, as represented by the authors’ reference to Michael Davis’ work), they first give the most common answers. Yet pushing their analysis in directions more sensitive to the Chinese ideological context allows them to propose alternate answers to these questions, thereby revealing some of the blind spots that may occur when scholars view partially unique local cultures of engineering through Western lenses. More practically, their chapter potently suggests how successful multinational collaborations in engineering may require keen sensitivity to the relevant intellectual environments of engineering education and professional practice.

Amy Slaton’s Chap. 8 returns the focus to the United States, albeit with many broader implications. She begins by describing the historical dominance of two ideological logics in engineering. The first of these is *technocratic*, which paints engineering as ultimately an apolitical enterprise that can be separated from its social foundations. The second logic she proposes is *meritocratic*, which privileges individual ability and responsibility to succeed in engineering while demonstrating technical excellence. Consistent with a neoliberal worldview, these two logics pose considerable challenges for those who identify with movements toward democratization, including by promoting a far more inclusive, participatory, and liberatory climate of technical education and professional practice. Hence, pivotally important for the Slaton are questions about how the content and aims of engineering are inextricably linked to the matter of who can be (or become) an engineer, not to mention what counts as epistemic authority in engineering. These themes are illustrated through a rich variety of literature and examples, from discussion of the trials and travails of various diversity and inclusion initiatives to explorations of how some specific student populations (e.g., those with low socioeconomic status or atypical kinds of cognitive dis/abilities) are “othered” against the backdrop of a powerfully normative status quo in engineering.

Derrick Hudson's Chap. 9 explores the continued challenges of attracting, recruiting, and educating African Americans, people of African ancestry and other underrepresented groups in engineering across the United States and globally. He begins by reminding us that the numbers of African Americans in engineering have stagnated and declined since the beginning of the twenty-first century. An important connection that Hudson highlights is that the early pioneers of scholars in African American studies thought that they could easily construct a reverse mirror image of the curricula they encountered in other academic disciplines, such as history, political science, or anthropology. A glaring omission of the early pioneers is the work that would be needed in engineering education. Many early pioneers failed to take into account that work needs to also be done directly within engineering education to foster "sociotechnical" engineering undergraduates and professionals. Hudson's work compliments Cech's exploration of the "ideologies of depoliticization and meritocracy" by emphasizing that one of the nagging disconnects for African Americans and other historically underrepresented minorities is that engineering is framed in a manner that cannot address social justice or liberatory issues in society. Hudson concludes his section with suggestions for further research, highlighting the continued pivotal role of historically black colleges and universities and the need to encourage more investments to promote research and development in African universities, which account for less than 2 % of research expenditure globally.

Finally, Erin Cech and Heidi Sherick's Chap. 10, focused on the "ideology of depoliticization", serves as a fine compliment to Slaton's work.. Their chapter nicely captures and questions a pervasive view that the technical dimensions of engineering work can and should be separated from any associated political, social, or cultural considerations. Cech and Sherick's challenge echoes one present in other recent work by Caroline Baillie, Jens Kabo, and John Raeder (2012) and by Bill Williams, José Figueiredo, and James Trevelyan (2014). Such ideological boundary work – which may be contrasted with the sort of "strategic politicization" described in Zhu and Jesiek's discussion of Marxism and engineering in the Chinese context – projects a sanitized image of engineering as ultimately divorceable from anything deemed subjective, sociocultural, or humanistic – that is, anything "non-technical." As a consequence, engineering is portrayed as not only technocratic, following Slaton, but also somehow above ideology, artfully concealing the inherently value-laden and social character of engineering work behind a veil of purported objectivity and rationality. Of particular note in this chapter is the authors' discussion of how engineering education helps perpetuate this ideology, including by protecting and preserving historically dominant – but increasingly outdated – images of the profession's epistemological, ethical, and ontological foundations. In turn, this hegemonic reproduction poses considerable impediments to reforming and transforming engineering faculty, courses, curricula, and culture to meaningfully breach the boundaries between the technical and sociocultural.

In summary, the chapters in this part offer a compelling invitation for further studies that help enhance our understanding of the ideological considerations that undergird the education of engineers and their practice as professionals. Each in its own way invites increased awareness of the importance of intellectual, cultural, and ideological contexts associated with both the objects of our research, i.e., engineers and engineering, and our own work as scholars. If such ideological contents are explicitly offered, imposed, or revealed in certain contexts, what about the implicit beliefs that fail to be questioned because of their invisibility? As these chapters suggest, considerations such as free market principles, efficiency, economic growth, political commitments, and techno-optimism are often inextricably bound up with questions about what counts as engineering and who can be an engineer. This section opens up opportunities for further efforts to expand the breadth and depth of ideological considerations, including through cross-institutional and cross-national comparative studies.

References

- Alder, K. (1999). *Engineering the revolution: Arms and enlightenment in France, 1763–1815*. Princeton: University Press.
- Baillie, C., Kabo, J., & Raeder, J. (2012). *Heterotopia: Alternatives pathways to social justice*. Alresford, Hants. (UK): John Hunt Publishing.
- Downey, G. L., & Lucena, J. C. (2004). Knowledge and professional identity in engineering: Code-switching and the metrics of progress. *History and Technology*, 20(4), 393–420.
- Downey, G. L., Lucena, J. C., & Mitcham, C. (2007). Engineering ethics and identity: Emerging initiatives in comparative perspective. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 13(4), 463–487.
- Layton, E. (1971). *The revolt of the engineers: Social responsibility and the American engineering profession*. Cleveland: Press of Case Western Reserve University, 2nd edn, 1986. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Noble, D. F. (1977). *America by design: Science, technology, and the rise of corporate capitalism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Williams, B., Figueiredo, J., & Trevelyan, J. (2014). *Engineering practice in a global context: Understanding the technical and the social*. Leiden: CRC Press. Taylor & Francis Group, London, UK

Brent K. Jesiek B.S. Electrical Engineering, Michigan Tech, M.S. and Ph.D. in STS, Virginia Tech. Assistant Professor, School of Engineering Education and School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Purdue University; Associate Director of Global Engineering Program, Purdue University. Research interests: historical and social studies of engineering, engineering education, and computing; engineering epistemologies; global engineering education; and cyber infrastructures for engineering education research.

Christelle Didier B.S. in Electrochemistry Engineering, M.A. in Education, Ph.D. in Sociology from Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), Paris. From 1993 to 2013, Assistant Professor, Lille University, France, Ethics Department. Assistant Professor, Charles de Gaulle University of Lille, Education Department. Member of CIREL (EA 4354). Co-author of *Ethique industrielle* (DeBoeck, Brussels, 1998), author of *Penser l'éthique des ingénieurs* (PUF, Paris, 2008) and *Les ingénieurs et l'éthique. Pour un regard sociologique* (Hermes 2008). She has published many articles on ethics and social responsibility in the engineering profession and education, and on the engineering profession's values (from interviews and extensive surveys). Research areas: engineering ethics and values, including historical, cultural and gender perspective, sustainable development and corporate social responsibility, social responsibility.