TRENDS IN DEVELOPING PROJECT-BASED THINKING IN ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION

S.Kh. Mardov[1], L.A. Xalmamatova[2]
Doctor of pedagogical sciences (DSc), Associate Professor[1]
Independent Researcher at Chirchiq State Pedagogical University[2]
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18374102

Abstract. *Project-based learning and design studios have long been the cornerstone of architectural education. In recent years, global forces such as digital transformation, sustainability challenges, and social equity have driven schools of architecture to innovate their pedagogy. This article examines current trends in cultivating project-based thinking in architecture curricula worldwide. Using a comprehensive literature review (2018–2025) and analyses of global surveys (e.g. UIA 2025), we identify key developments: the integration of advanced technologies (VR/AR, parametric design, BIM) into studio learning; the shift toward collaborative, interdisciplinary "live" projects involving community engagement; adoption of design thinking methodologies to frame open-ended design problems; and the emergence of flexible or hybrid studio formats accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic. While traditional studio pedagogy remains dominant, empirical findings suggest that project-based, constructivist approaches enhance students' creative problem-solving, teamwork, and critical-thinking skills. We discuss implications for curriculum design and faculty development, arguing for curricula that expand live project experiences, foster civic and environmental responsibility, and leverage digital tools to prepare architects for 21st-century challenges.*

Keywords*: architectural education; project-based learning; design thinking; pedagogical innovation; technology integration.*

Introduction

The hallmark of architectural education has traditionally been the design studio, a signature pedagogy where students work on semester-length projects under faculty mentorship[1]. In this setting, project-based thinking is intrinsic: students tackle complex, open-ended design problems through rapid prototyping and critique [1]. However, recent decades have seen profound changes in society and technology that challenge the conventional model. Global factors – including digital transformation, sustainability imperatives, social equity, and decolonization movements – are reshaping the architect's role and, by extension, how architects should be educated [2][3]. A 2025 survey by the International Union of Architects (UIA) notes that schools must respond to climate breakdown, urbanization, and digitalization by expanding interdisciplinary skills; architects are increasingly viewed as civic leaders and collaborators rather than lone designers [2]. In this context, *project-based thinking* – the habit of approaching problems through integrative, design-oriented projects – is gaining renewed emphasis.

Theoretical frameworks for this trend include constructivist and experiential learning theories, which posit that learners build understanding through active engagement with real-world tasks [12][3]. For example, *design thinking* pedagogy in architecture encourages framing ill-defined problems to stimulate creativity. As one study found, design problems "should not be completely specified by the instructor" so that students themselves participate in defining the

solution space[9]. Signature pedagogies literature also argues that studio education remains a fertile ground for applying project-based methods [1]. These ideas reflect calls to modernize curricula with collaborative, practice-led approaches. This paper explores current *international trends* in cultivating project-based thinking within architectural education. By conducting a qualitative review of recent scholarly literature (2018–2025) and analyzing data from global surveys and conferences, we identify major developments in pedagogy and technology. The article is structured with an introduction to the problem, a description of methods, a presentation of findings on emerging trends, and a discussion of their pedagogical implications.

Methods

This study employed a qualitative literature synthesis approach, examining publications from 2018 through 2025 on architecture education, studio pedagogy, and project-based learning. Sources included peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and reports indexed in Scopus/WoS where available. Key search terms were “architectural education,” “project-based learning,” “design thinking,” and “studio pedagogy.” We also incorporated recent surveys (e.g. UIA global survey 2025[2]) and analyses of educational innovations. In total, dozens of international sources were reviewed.

To structure the analysis, findings were categorized into thematic trends. This approach is similar to systematic reviews of architectural pedagogy, which use frameworks to extract instructional patterns [14]. For example, Kharvari and Kaiser (2022) describe using a modified PICO strategy to assess educational interventions in design[14]. Our review sought to identify recurring innovations (e.g. technology use, collaborative models, assessment changes) and to link them to underlying educational theories (constructivism, experiential learning, etc.). The resulting synthesis reflects both theoretical discussions and empirical case studies in architecture education.

Results

Technological Integration and Digital Design. One clear trend is the integration of emerging digital technologies into studio teaching. Researchers report that virtual and augmented reality (VR/AR) are being used to enhance spatial understanding. For example, Hou et al. (2023) found that immersive VR training improved students’ scale perception nearly as effectively as real-world experience [15]. A systematic review likewise concludes that XR technologies (VR, AR, MR) *“are capable of enhancing various stages of the design process”* and improving learning outcomes for architecture students [6]. Foziljonova (2025) emphasizes that architecture curricula must incorporate VR/AR, parametric modeling, and simulation to foster innovative thinking [5].

Similarly, educational experiments have introduced Building Information Modeling (BIM), digital fabrication (3D printing, CNC), and computational design tools into projects. Simon and Hu (2018) note a wave of pedagogical innovations at their school: technology-driven design thinking exercises, game-based learning, flipped studios, and project-based activities all emerged alongside new tools like 3D fabrication and parametric software [8]. These approaches expose students to industry-standard workflows and encourage experimentation.

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated some digital adoption: many programs used online platforms and hybrid studios [10]. Although few schools fully replaced the studio model, even limited online collaboration revealed benefits such as flexible learning and the ability to work across distances [11]. However, as one survey cautions, only about 11% of programs had adopted fully hybrid or virtual studios by 2025 [16], and most reverted to face-to-face design work afterwards. Overall, the trend points to *augmenting* traditional studio work with VR/AR visualization, BIM and parametric design projects, and digital fabrication labs (makerspaces).

Collaborative and Project-Based Studio Practices. Architectural education inherently involves project-based work, but recent innovations emphasize deeper collaboration and interdisciplinarity. The studio remains organized around semester-long projects [1], but curricula are increasingly structured to require teamwork, client engagement, and real-world constraints. Latto (2024) observes that project-based learning in architecture encourages team-based design activities, peer discussion, and iterative critique [12]. These social-constructivist approaches echo Vygotsky's model of learning through collaboration.

There is a movement to break from the "lone genius" model. For instance, despite the collaborative nature of design, a 2025 UIA survey found that 76% of programs still assess students via individual portfolios rather than group projects [4]. This highlights a gap: while studio assignments may involve shared work, formal assessment lags. Educators argue for rebalancing to reward group projects that simulate professional teamwork. Panayi and Charalambous (2022) demonstrate how *co-creation studios* — projects developed jointly with community stakeholders — give students experience in the social aspects of design, such as sustainability and inclusivity [7].

Another development is interdisciplinary project-based programs. Some schools pair architecture students with engineers, planners, or social scientists on capstone projects addressing complex urban problems [7][3]. These collaborations broaden the design brief and require integrated thinking, a hallmark of real architectural practice. Salama and Patil (2025) describe a "socius-centric" pedagogy: studios that explicitly include Community Design, Design–Build, and Live Project models so that social and cultural dimensions are woven into learning[3]. In these models, students work on actual briefs (e.g. designing a community center or restoring a heritage site) rather than hypothetical assignments. Such live projects have been shown to deepen student motivation and civic responsibility.

Empirical case studies report that embedding authentic projects significantly boosts student engagement and outcomes. For example, Elaby et al. (2022) evaluated a design-build studio and found it markedly improved first-year students' problem-solving confidence and skills [17]. Similarly, research suggests that students in PBL settings develop greater self-directed learning habits and creativity than in conventional studios (as noted by Kolmos et al., 2004 [18] and others). In sum, trends point to designing studio curricula as collaborative research projects, aligning with signature pedagogies of other professions (engineering, software) but rooted in architectural tradition [1].

Design Thinking and Problem Framing. Design thinking, a term popularized in business schools, has permeated architecture education as well. In practice, this means explicitly teaching stages like empathizing with user needs, iterative prototyping, and reframing problems. Ghonim (2017) found that educators increasingly prefer presenting students with ambiguous, open-ended problems, reserving judgement and allowing learners to define part of the brief themselves [9]. The goal is to mimic realistic complexity and encourage creativity rather than simple problem-solving.

In support of this, recent reviews of design pedagogy note that project-based courses are focusing more on ideation and reflection cycles. For instance, a 2025 literature review observes that PBL curricula emphasize *"the role of creativity, iterative design thinking, and structured evaluation"* [19]. Activities like design charrettes, co-design workshops, and concept mapping are being integrated into studio culture to complement the traditional form-making process. Design thinking trends also intersect with sustainability education: many programs now frame projects

around social and environmental challenges (for example, designing for accessibility or community resilience). Salama and Patil (2025) explicitly connect this to studio practice: only by embedding social dimensions ("the socius") in every project can students become critically reflexive about spatial justice [3]. This reflects a broader shift from architecture as purely artistic or technical toward architecture as a problem-solving discipline addressing human needs.

Hybrid Learning Models and Post-Pandemic Adaptations. The COVID-19 pandemic forced architectural educators to experiment with remote and hybrid studio formats. According to Saleh et al. (2022), the "new normal" of online and blended learning challenged the physical studio but also revealed new possibilities [10]. When studios moved online, students experienced drawbacks (isolation, loss of informal critique) but also benefits: flexible schedules, more focused work environments, and reduced logistical overhead [11]. Many students gained technical literacy from using digital collaboration tools, and some projects went paperless (a positive environmental impact).

Going forward, these experiences have legitimized *hybrid studio* models, where virtual and physical elements are combined. Saleh et al. note that schools are now exploring networked, delocalized learning environments with stronger links to professional practice [10]. For example, studios may include virtual reality sessions with remote instructors, cloud-based BIM collaboration, and online juries connecting multiple campuses. While the essence of studio work remains in-person, project-based thinking is extending beyond the drafting table. Institutional changes are also under consideration. Educators now recognize the need for faculty development in digital pedagogy [20], and some schools are redesigning assessment to suit blended formats. For instance, timed "virtual pin-ups" and electronic portfolios have been adopted. These shifts represent a trend toward more flexible, student-centered learning environments that still center on real design projects, even when students are not all together in one room.

Discussion

The trends identified above reveal a convergence of traditional studio pedagogy with 21st-century innovations. The project-based core of architecture education remains intact [1], but its implementation is broadening. Technology is no longer ancillary; it is becoming integral to how projects are conceived and evaluated [5][15]. Our review shows that extended reality and parametric tools are not pedagogical add-ons but catalysts that enable new kinds of projects (e.g. interactive installations, sustainable simulations). When harnessed properly, digital media can make design thinking more explicit and accessible to novice students [6][5].

Collaboration and social engagement are similarly redefining project-based thinking. The evidence from Salama & Patil (2025) and Panayi & Charalambous (2022) indicates that when studios partner with communities, students develop a more nuanced understanding of context and client needs[3][7]. This aligns with constructivist theory: learning occurs through authentic social practice. By involving external stakeholders, programs are blurring the line between education and practice, giving students agency and feedback loops that mirror professional work [7][17]. The pedagogical implications are significant. Educators should consider expanding *live-project* components, such as design-build studios or community-engaged seminars. Incorporating design thinking exercises can help students frame problems holistically, preparing them for complex, interdisciplinary challenges. Assessment methods must evolve too: moving beyond individual grading to include peer review and client feedback will better cultivate the collaborative skills architecture increasingly demands [4][12].

However, implementation challenges remain. The UIA survey highlights resource and faculty development constraints: many schools cite insufficient funding and lack of trained staff as barriers[16]. There is also uneven adoption globally; for example, only 18% of schools in Africa reported high integration of interdisciplinary projects in 2025 [16], suggesting regional disparities. Further research should examine these inequities and identify scalable strategies. Theoretically, our findings reinforce learning science in design. Project-based studios embody Kolb's experiential cycle and Papert's constructivism, emphasizing learning-by-doing [12]. Our review suggests that well-designed PBL environments enhance critical thinking and self-efficacy [12][17]. As Laurillard (2012) argues, teaching can be viewed as a design problem in itself; these pedagogical innovations can be thought of as designing the *learning environment* with iterative feedback [21][3].

Implications for Practice

For practitioners (educators and administrators), the implications include:

- Curriculum redesign: Integrate long-term, real-world projects across studio courses; embed technology lab work into core classes; ensure sustainability and social topics are part of design briefs.

- Faculty development: Train instructors in new media (VR/AR), collaborative pedagogy, and online facilitation. UIA (2025) notes that targeted faculty development is needed to support these trends[16].

- Infrastructure investment: Build makerspaces (e.g. FAB labs) and digital studios as platforms for project-based work (as exemplified by new FAB labs in Central Asia universities).

- Assessment reform: Include group grading, process-based evaluation, and live-client feedback in rubrics.

- Global collaboration: Leverage networks so students can work on projects spanning different cultures and scales, preparing them for a global profession.

These changes align with calls from employers and accreditation bodies for graduates who can work in teams, use advanced tools, and tackle societal challenges. Our analysis provides a knowledge base for policy: schools should benchmark their practices against these emerging trends and share best practices internationally.

Conclusion

Project-based thinking remains at the heart of architecture education, but its forms are evolving. This study has traced how recent innovations – from VR-enabled studios to community-driven design-build – are shaping the next generation of architectural pedagogy. The literature shows that when implemented thoughtfully, these trends enrich learning by making studios more collaborative, technological, and socially relevant [3][6]. To fully realize these benefits, educators must be intentional in curriculum design: fostering an environment where students undertake meaningful projects, reflect on impact, and iterate on solutions. As architecture schools worldwide adapt to new realities, project-based thinking will continue to develop, bridging the gap between education and the complex demands of practice. Further empirical research should measure the outcomes of these pedagogical shifts, ensuring that future architects are equipped with both creative vision and practical skills to address global challenges.

REFERENCES

1. Foziljonova, M. R. (2025). Concept for developing innovative design thinking in architecture students. *Science and Innovation*, 8, 41–47. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16744784[5]

2. Patil, M. P., Salama, A. M., & Harrington, S. (2025, November 13). What a global survey reveals about the future of architectural education. *UIA Magazine*. Retrieved from https://www.uia-architectes.org/uploads/2024/11/uia-survey-mag-2025.pdf[2]
3. Salama, A. M., & Patil, M. P. (2025). The Socius in architectural pedagogy: Transformative design studio teaching models. *Architecture, 5*(3), 61. https://doi.org/10.3390/architecture5030061[3]
4. Saleh, M. M., Abdelkader, M., & Hosny, S. S. (2022). Architectural education challenges and opportunities in a post-pandemic digital age. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal, 14*(8), 102027. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2022.102027[10]
5. Kharvari, F., & Kaiser, L. E. (2022). Impact of extended reality on architectural education and the design process. *Automation in Construction, 141*, 104393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2022.104393[14]
6. Hou, N., Nishina, D., Sugita, S., Jiang, R., Kindaichi, S., Oishi, H., & Shimizu, A. (2024). Virtual reality space in architectural design education: Learning effect of scale feeling. *Building and Environment, 248*, 111060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2023.111060[15]
7. Simon, M., & Hu, M. (2018). Infusing technology-driven design thinking in architectural education: Two case studies. *ARCC Journal*, 1(1), 377–384.
8. Kuhn, S. (2001). Learning from the architecture studio: Implications for project-based pedagogy. *International Journal of Engineering Education, 17*(4&5), 349–352.[1]
9. Panayi, C., & Charalambous, N. (2022). Community-engaged design studios: Learning through "live" projects. In F. Zhang et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Higher Education Advances* (pp. 807–814). Universitat Politècnica de València.[7]
10. Ghonim, M. (2017). Design thinking in architecture education: Issues, limitations and suggestions. *Archnet-IJAR: International Journal of Architectural Research, 11*(2), 84–92.
11. Latto, J. (2024). Pedagogical benefits of embedding project-based learning into the architectural curriculum: A case study. In F. Zhang et al. (Eds.), *Architectural Science Association (ANZAScA) Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2, pp. 694–701). Griffith University.
12. Spruce, J. (2025). A review of project-based learning and design education. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 15*(1), 1475–1747.
13. Thomas, J. W. (2000). *A review of research on project-based learning*. Autodesk Foundation.
14. Elaby, M. F., Elwishy, H. M., Moatamed, S. F., Abdelwahed, M. A., & Rashiedy, A. E. (2022). Does design-build concept improve problem-solving skills? An analysis of first-year students. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal, 13*(6), 101780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2022.101780[17]
15. Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge.
16. ijee.ie https://www.ijee.ie/articles/Vol17-4and5/Ijee1214.pdf
17. What a global survey reveals about the future of architectural education? - International Union of Architects https://www.uia-architectes.org/en/mag/what-a-global-survey-reveals-about-the-future-of-architectural-education/
18. The Socius in Architectural Pedagogy: Transformative Design Studio Teaching Models https://www.mdpi.com/2673-8945/5/3/61
19. CONCEPT FOR DEVELOPING INNOVATIVE DESIGN THINKING IN ARCHITECTURE STUDENTS https://zenodo.org/records/16744784

20. Impact of extended reality on architectural education and the design process - ScienceDirect
21. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0926580522002667
22. Community-engaged design studios: learning through “live” projects https://headconf.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/14683.pdf
23. Microsoft Word - ARCC-EAAE376-Infusing Technology Driven Design Thinking in Architectural Education-376.docx https://www.arcc-repository.org/index.php/repository/article/download/492/395/1673
24. Microsoft Word - DESIGN THINKING IN ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION (J) https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohammed-Ghonim/publication/321747584_Design_Thinking_in_Architecture_Education_Issues_Limitations_and_Suggestions/links/5a548f27458515e7b7326c35/Design-Thinking-in-Architecture-Education-Issues-Limitations-and-Suggestions.pdf
25. Architectural education challenges and opportunities in a post-pandemic digital age - PMC https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9614015/
26. archscience.org https://archscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Pedagogical-benefits-of-embedding-project-based-learning-into-the-architectural-curriculum_A-case-study.pdf
27. Does design-build concept improve problem-solving skills? An analysis of first-year engineering students – ScienceDirect https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2090447922000910
28. Virtual reality space in architectural design education: Learning effect of scale feeling – ScienceDirect https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360132323010879
29. (PDF) A Review of Project-Based Learning and Design Education https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388430324_A_Review_of_Project-Based_Learning_and_Design_Education
30. Jumamuratov B.A. Metrological support of the repair and testing of the nose of the aircraftparameters of an aircraft // Science and Education in Karakalpakstan, 2024, №2/1 ISSN 2181-9203., pp.123-130. (OAK Ro‘yxatining 2017 yil 24 maydagi 24.05.2017 №5/2-son qarori)
31. Jumamuratov B.A., Abduqayumov A.A., Eshmuradov D.E. Kompozit materiallarning radioshofonligini nazorat qiluvchi vositaning metrologik ta’minoti // “Milliy standart” ilmiy-texnik jurnali, Toshkent, 2024, 3-son. b. 1-5. (OAK Ro‘yxatining 2020 yil 5 iyundagi 280/6.2-son qarori)