

Editorial

Ilgı Toprak 

Independent Researcher (PhD), Co-editor of Journal of Design Studio, Washington DC, USA

Refer: Toprak, I., (2021), Editorial, Journal of Design Studio, V:3, N:1, pp 3-4

ORCID: 0000-0002-3952-8887

DOI: 10.46474/jds.editorialv3n1 <https://doi.org/10.46474/jds.editorialv3n1>

Editorial

This summer, Journal of Design Studio has successfully completed two years of publishing. This issue covers eleven articles, including six research articles, a review article and four design studio cases.

The first research article entitled “Insight into a Personalized Procedure of Design in Concept Generation by the Students in Architecture Thesis Projects” by Rahman Tafahomi investigates concept framing and developing trends among students in architectural capstone projects – also referred as graduation project, final year project or senior project. The results indicate that students selected their own personal approach under the influences of the supervisors for conceptual design, using a subjective approach rather than a structured process.

The second research article by Guliz Ozorhon and Gulbin Lekesiz is entitled “Re-considering the Architectural Design Studio after Pandemic: Tools, Problem, Potential”. This article provides a framework of an adapted online architectural design studio enriched with environment-specific tools for online education. The components of this collaborative learning approach enable participatory production and allow interaction by means of workshops and seminars.

The third research article “Intuition in the Design Studio: A Perspective on Student’s Creativity and Design Process” by Zeynep Ozge Yalcin examines the role and the dimensions of intuition in the architectural design studio. The results of the study demonstrate that intuition has a crucial role in the design process.

The fourth research article entitled “Going Digital in Design Education: Restructuring the Emotional Bonds in the Online Studio” by Yasemin Burcu Baloglu and Ahmet Sezgin investigate students’ bonding with the architectural design studio, during the transition to online education by means of semi-structured interviews conducted with students from the faculty. Students discuss the effects of the transition process— notably changes in social relationships, time-space routines, safe space, and their perceptions of personal space.

The fifth research article is “Situated Learning in Online Architectural Studio Education” by Ece Buldan. The article aims to examine particular changes in the design studio when moved into an online environment, especially two aspects of the studio culture: “studio as method” and “studio as environment”. She investigates an online design studio based on the theory of situated learning.

The sixth research article by Zeynep Ceylanli, Elif Aktas Yanas is entitled “A Critical Assessment of an Extended Learning Environment in Interior Design Studio”. This exploratory research based on qualitative techniques assesses the students’ approach to design process in face-to-face and online experiential learning environment. The study aims to provide a new perspective to the interior design

students about space and user relationship regarding interaction and atmosphere, not only in terms of the given design problem but also the ‘environment’ they are experiencing through the design process.

The review article entitled “An Architectural Debate: The Dilemmas of Architectural Complexity in Design Studios and the Teacher’s Role” by Dania Abdelaziz argue that teacher-student interaction enhances the design learning as well as design teaching. It ensures students’ awareness of their roles as learners and the role of their teachers. Teaching-learning journey becomes more fruitful with increasing interaction between teachers and students, it helps students to boost their confidence and release their uncertainties.

The journal comprises four design studio case articles in this issue. The first design studio case by Pinar Sezginalp and Selin Ust entitled “Adapting to Living Space in the First Interior Design Studio” examines the case of online versus face-to-face learning experiences of two different groups of students as “initial experience of an interior design studio” – where they start to interact with classmates and encounter an interior architecture project for the first time.

The second design studio case article by Bilgen Tuncer Manzakoglu, Renk Dimli Oraklibel entitled “A Design Management and Design Thinking Approach for Developing Smart Product Service System Design: Projects from Online Industrial Design Studio” investigates three student projects as case studies of Smart-PSSs designed in three stages: system design, product design, and interface design. They argue that students achieve a more holistic approach of the design process, taking account of new expansions in industrial design.

The third design studio case by Waldemar Jenek, Glenda Caldwell, Jared Donovan, Veronica Garcia Henson, Matt Adcock, Mingze XI, Kavita Gonsalves is entitled “Exploring Immersive Technology to Design Architecture Empowering Marginalized People: A Case Study of Australian Postgraduate Design Education”. The study focuses on a case study investigating architecture students’ use of media architecture design with real-time-render software tools to provide solutions to people without permanent residence. This study is part of an ongoing PhD research at Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.

The fourth design studio case article by Derya Uzal, Başak Eren is entitled “Adaptation of First-Year Architectural Design Studio Over Accessible Resources”. This study discusses the experience of MEF University First-Year Design Studio, through the use of essential resources and their possible adaptations for the first-year architectural design studio (second term) under COVID-19 lockdown regulations. They emphasize accessibility and materiality as Fundamentals of Design Studio, as attributes that must adapt to studio members’ changing opportunities and environments.