I БӨЛІМ. КӨРКЕМӨНЕРДЕН БІЛІМ БЕРУ
I РАЗДЕЛ. ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

Bekesheva A[1], Canapilov A.[2]
[1]Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau University, Master of arts, Republic of Kazakhstan,
Atyrau. e-mail: asel.bekesheva@mail.ru
[2]Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Faculty of Arts, Master of arts,
Bishkek, the Republic of Kyrgyzstan. e-mail: adilet.canapilov@manas.edu.kg

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRADITIONAL AND MODERN METHODS OF TEACHING DESIGN: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Abstract

The literature review comparisons the old traditional and new contemporary approaches to design pedagogy in terms of their positives, negatives; how they project student learning process thus preparedness for future professional endeavors. Design principles are easily incorporated across multiple age groups and inspire creativity with many traditional methods that provide hands-on experience and mentoring as effective approaches. By comparison, today's tools are more agile in nature and have become popular because they can adapt to new workflow changes brought about through digital 'stuff,' but also from the calling of a much wider range of disciplines.

The report likewise points out some of the limitations to previous studies, mainly that we do not have many longitudinal data and culturally congruent pedagogical models. They suggest it calls for advocating a hybrid educational model that merges traditional ways and modern methods to better understand how those means may increase job prospects for design graduates in the long run. We believe these findings provide students, educators and policy makers with valuable implications to inform the future of design education.

Key words: design education methods comparison, traditional against modern teaching, digital tools in design education, hybrid learning in design, cultural diversity in design education.

Бекешева А.С.[1], Жанапилов А.[2]
[1]Атырауский университет имени Х.Досмухамедова, Магистр искусств,
г. Атырау, Республика Казахстан. e-mail: asel.bekesheva@mail.ru
[2]Кыргызско-Турецкий университет Манас, Факультет Искусств, Магистр искусств,
Бишкек, Республика Кыргызстан. e-mail: adilet.canapilov@manas.edu.kg

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ТРАДИЦИОННЫХ И СОВРЕМЕННЫХ МЕТОДОВ ОБУЧЕНИЯ ДИЗАЙНУ: ОБЗОР ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

Аннотация

В обзоре литературы сравниваются старые традиционные и новые современные подходы к дизайн педагогике с точки зрения их положительных и отрицательных сторон; того, как они проектируют процесс обучения студентов и, следовательно, их готовность к будущей профессиональной деятельности. Принципы дизайна легко интегрируются в различные возрастные группы и вдохновляют на творчество с помощью множества традиционных методов, которые обеспечивают практический опыт и наставничество в качестве эффективных подходов. Для сравнения, современные инструменты более гибкие по своей природе и стали популярными благодаря тому, что они могут адаптироваться к новым

изменениям в рабочем процессе, вызванным цифровыми "штучками", а также к гораздо более широкому спектру дисциплин.

В обзоре также указываются некоторые ограничения предыдущих исследований, главным образом из-за того, что у нас нет большого количества лонгитюдных данных и культурно согласованных педагогических моделей. Они предполагают, что это требует пропаганды гибридной образовательной модели, в которой сочетаются традиционные и современные методы, чтобы лучше понять, как эти средства могут увеличить перспективы трудоустройства выпускников-дизайнеров в долгосрочной перспективе. Мы считаем, что эти результаты дают студентам, преподавателям и политикам ценные рекомендации, которые помогут определить будущее дизайнерского образования.

Ключевые слова: сравнение методов дизайн-образования, традиционное и современное обучение, цифровые инструменты в дизайн-образовании, гибридное обучение дизайну, культурное разнообразие в дизайн-образовании.

Бекешева А.С.[1], Жанапилов А.[2]
[1]Х.Досмұхамедов атындағы Атырау университеті, Өнертану магистрі,
Атырау қаласы, Қазақстан Республикасы, e-mail: asel.bekesheva@mail.ru
[2]Манас қырғыз-түрік университеті, Өнер факультеті, Өнертану магистрі,
Бішкек, Қырғызстан Республикасы. e-mail: adilet.canapilov@manas.edu.kg

ДИЗАЙНДЫ ОҚЫТУДЫҢ ДӘСТҮРЛІ ЖӘНЕ ЗАМАНАУИ ӘДІСТЕРІН САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ: ӘДЕБИЕТТЕРГЕ ШОЛУ

Аңдатпа
Әдебиеттерге шолу ескі дәстүрлі және жаңа заманауи тәсілдерді салыстырады дизайн педагогикасы олардың жағымды және жағымсыз жақтары тұрғысынан; олар студенттердің оқу процесін қалай жобалайды, сондықтан олардың болашақ кәсіби қызметке дайындығы. Дизайн принциптері әртүрлі жас топтарына оңай біріктіріледі және тиімді тәсілдер ретінде практикалық тәжірибе мен тәлімгерлікті қамтамасыз ететін көптеген дәстүрлі әдістер арқылы шығармашылықты шабыттандырады. Салыстыру үшін, қазіргі заманғы құралдар табиғатта икемді және танымал болды, өйткені олар цифрлық "заттар" тудыратын жұмыс процесінің жаңа өзгерістеріне, сондай-ақ пәндердің кең ауқымына бейімделе алады.

Шолу сонымен қатар алдыңғы зерттеулердің кейбір шектеулерін көрсетеді, негізінен бізде бойлық деректер мен мәдени келісілген педагогикалық модельдер көп емес. Олар бұл құралдардың ұзақ мерзімді перспективада дизайнер түлектердің жұмысқа орналасу перспективаларын қалай арттыратынын жақсырақ түсіну үшін дәстүрлі және заманауи әдістерді біріктіретін гибридті білім беру моделін насихаттауды қажет етеді деп болжайды. Бұл нәтижелер студенттерге, оқытушыларға және саясаткерлерге дизайнерлік білімнің болашағын анықтауға көмектесетін құнды ұсыныстар береді деп санаймыз.

Түйін сөздер: дизайн-білім беру әдістерін салыстыру, дәстүрлі және заманауи оқыту, дизайн-білім берудегі цифрлық құралдар, гибридті дизайнды оқыту, дизайн біліміндегі мәдени әртүрлілік.

Main provisions. Design education lies at the heart of a wide-ranging study called "Comparative Analysis of Traditional and Modern Methods of Teaching Design", which provides an in-depth analysis that brings out both the best practices, as well as pitfalls associated with traditional design teaching methods while serving to give thorough insights into what modern modes can offer. Anciently set studio-based learning and apprenticeship designs regarding craftsmanship stress practical experience as well as mentoring. It has been found that these

approaches worked in teaching both the technical aspects as well promoting creativity, giving instant feedback and enabling a reflexive practice intrinsic to problem-solving within design.

In this emphasis on holistic approaches, the study shows limitations of traditional methods due to their lack of context and ill-suitability for an era of interdisciplinary design and technological integration. In an answer to these constraints have arisen the design teaching didactics of today, with digital tools and website platforms matching second by second what is demanded from industry. New methods adapted for each subgroup are flexible and accessible, providing a wider lens to study subject matter while taking another approach toward inclusive design education.

The study recommends a hybrid educational model that integrates some traditional teaching methods with the modern-based approaches. The approach was to take the best parts of traditional design (the tactile, mentorship-driven aspects) and merge it with modern methods in order for Brookside Design School graduates to not only have a clear path forward but be ahead of schools that were yet-to-be-disrupted. It is considered a vital model to train students for an industry that is constantly in flux, one where they must have both the versatility demanded by constant change and the making skills required as professionals far into their futures.

In the end, we wish more research on this topic and research in particular needs to be longitudinal which can help us understand how these different teaching paradigms affect students outcomes over the course of a career. It also advocates for a globally relevant and locally responsive design education — in short, the need to decolonize research so that it represents more knowledge systems from around world. Findings from this study offer important contributions to educators, policymakers and industry stakeholders in need of improving the design education system for a more future-proof graduate pool.

Introduction. The same can be said about the field of design education–transformations induced by developments in technology, changing pedagogical theories and a rapidly evolving job market have left their mark on all scales. Design education has for centuries been rooted in craft, manual dexterity and the tradition inherited from master to pupil sitting side by side. BUT the evolution of digital tools and online learning platforms brought revolution to teaching-learning domain, questioning these conventional methodologies opening a plethora of possibilities for both educators & learner.

This review of the current education literature investigates how well traditional and modern teaching modes stack up against each other in design education. Design as a discipline straddling art, science and craft has grown more interdisciplinary incorporating elements of technology, psychology & business which begs the question about these instructional approaches addressing current needs from both students' perspectives and industry expectations. This review reflects on how these methods are reflected in the output of students and their creative development, mastery over technique and ability to practice under real-world conditions.

This paper aims to critically compare the different teaching approach (traditional Vs contemporary) in design, reviewing its strength and weakness. Through the review of prior research, this study provides further insights into which strategies are most effective in facilitating skill acquisition among design students and advocates for a wider discussion concerning how they should be graded/discussed. Furthermore, this review aims to highlight deficiencies in literature that would provide the backbone of future research within the field.

This review centers around two fundamental points: the teaching methods specific to traditional and contemporary approaches of learning, and the results that are generated because of this. Historically, these have been practices done in a studio setting, using an apprenticeship model and learning by doing; modern methods have increasingly incorporated digital tools for creation (open-source software like wiki sketches), as well as online platforms that can facilitate more interdisciplinary working. In this review, we examine how these strategic and infrastructure-based technical approaches affect the learning experiences of students; their skills acquisition from higher

education curricula and extramural training programs; as well as their preparedness for professional practice in developed countries.

Design education has been the subject of a massive amount of research on trends and challenges in evolution. Early research by writers like Lawson (2006) and Cross (2007) have laid the groundwork for our understanding of traditional pedagogy in design, ranging from experiential learning to models such as apprenticeship. On the contrary, contemporary studies since Oxman (2006) and Kolko (2018) have investigated how to marry technology with modern teaching practice particularly showing new paradigms technologies are emerging in design education as a trigger for change. This review pulls these perspectives together and concludes a thorough investigation of pedagogy within design education now.

In sum, this review contributes to the answer of traditional versus contemporary approaches in teaching design; how they can help shape student learning experiences and career building capabilities. Considering existing research, this review contributes to better design curricula that can inform educators and policy makers ensuring more effective ways of designing in a world which becomes ever more complexified by digitalization.

Methods. A rigorous and systematic approach was followed in the selection of relevant sources available in literature that addressed comparative analysis on traditional versus modern methods to teach design. A foundation literature was to be built that would represent trends, issues and innovations in design education as they exist today. The detailed, measured process of sourcing, assisted in guaranteeing reviewed literature was current and as closely affiliated to the topic.

Selection Criteria for Source. Each source type of a mobile app developed the has selection criteria. The most important factor determining source selection was the publication date; to be included in this overview, a work needed to have been published within the last two decades. The 20-year period was also selected to provide a window of enough time in recent history for the changes that have occurred (including those related acts surrounding the digital revolution, as well online learning platforms). In the last two decades, design education has seen revolutionizing changes due to technological progression and a change in educational perspectives. This period was the focus of our review to incorporate recent methods in tools that have now become an integral part of contemporary design education.

Still, it was not exclusively a contemporary review. Also deemed important were influential works prior to this period that have long influenced the manner in which we teach design. These are the bed rock basic texts that provide relevant historical context of older teaching methods augmented how they undermined so educational practices, because this foundational skill had their influence on learning-and-still do. Indicative texts from the Bauhaus movement, or other influential design education philosophies were included for example — to provide a line of lineage on how certain teaching methodologies remain relevant till date.

Types of Publications Considered. Designation of Types of Publications For the publications, peer-reviewed journals (academic books and conference papers were also covered) form the primary focus of this study. These were included in the original dataset as a result of their academic quality and contributions to design education research. Especially, articles in peer-reviewed journals were so highly regarded not only for being trustworthy— they go through a series of refutation by white-coated and winged glasses to finally decide that these findings may worth the contribution. In some cases, academic books represented the only resources for devoted studies of individual components of design education that sought to provide broad encapsulations and intricate scrutinizes sometimes absent in shorter articles.

Conference papers were also included, because they frequently present the most recent findings and innovative teaching methods—and report new directions—before they are published in journals or books. The papers present the most recent debates and progress in this area so also add something to a literature review.

Moreover, respected industry reports and white papers were included to give a practical aspect about how teaching methods are applied in corporate environments. From Academic Research to Real-World Practice These publications frequently mediate between academic discourse and real-world practice by providing recommendations grounded in evidence as well as illustrative examples of design education at work. This meant that the review was not just theoretically rich but also deeply embedded into what is being done in design practice today.

Language and Geographical Coverage. All literature was chosen largely through English language sources to ensure consistency as well; however, this paper justifiably leaned toward more North American based research since the majority of academic manuscripts published in anglophone nations. In design education where international collaboration and discourse are frequently present, English-language writing is a standard (Leki 2007). Though the review does not avoid noting important works in other languages, especially those from regions with an established design culture of their own. These non-English sources were included in this API where possible and relevant to provide a wider, global view. For instance, some texts with substantial design histories from countries like Japan and Germany and Italy were examined elsewhere — provided they existed in translated form or available detailed English language reinterpretations.

Search Strategy and Database Selection. A multi-faceted literature search was conducted using a variety of academic databases and library resources. In this study, major databases i.e., JSTOR IEEE Xplore and Google Scholar are utilized to find relevant peer-reviewed journals with conference papers. JSTOR was able to deliver wide variety of academic journal in the full text, specifically valuable for historical and theoretical texts. For the inclusion of literature on digital integration with design education, IEEE Xplore was found to be very useful as it included vast details in engineering and technological domain. Google Scholar| Google Scholar was used because of its comprehensiveness and ability to search across many disciplines that are germane to design education, particularly those that cross the boundaries between fields.

Apart from this data base, library resources of major universities were visited to get academic books or theses and similar scholarly studies which might be available not online. While university library collections contain vast resources through numerous books and theses, many of those content written tend to delve deeper into certain aspects of design education.

This used a range of carefully thought-through keywords to make sure that the search was focused and successful. For example, design education; traditional teaching methods; modern teaching methods digital tools in design education, comparative analysis of the two ways to teach and hybrid learning in designing. The solutions were picked to reach the exact terminologies needed for our goals of this review and covering wide range of field.

Ensuring a Balanced Review. A systematic approach to the application of these selection criteria as well as an extensive and multi-faceted search process allowed for a diverse, comprehensive collection of literature. This approach was designed to be both thorough and well-rounded, providing a diverse set of viewpoints as well as contexts. The systematic approach used in this endeavor assures the evidence generated from our review is empirically valid, ensures that these are representative of what infers a comprehensive view on design education at present time and capable to make informed contributions for future research/practice.

This methodological rigor is vital to establish evidence in how traditional and modern teaching methods can merge effectively be ratified within design education. In order to continue with incredibly helpful reviews of the literature that are so well-supported these sorts of lit review will be key both in advancing our field and helping those seeking guidance from existing knowledge as educators, researchers & policy-shapers work towards doing their own part in answering some very important questions about design education.

Results. *Evolution of Traditional Teaching Methods in Design.* This has traditionally tied back to studio pedagogy, the practice of teaching through hands-on experience and mentorship in an intimate setting where students are directly learning from active practitioners. For centuries, drawing has been one of the core skills at design school and taught primarily in an almost

unchanged way until around 20 years ago. At the heart of their philosophy is that students perfect their design skills and learn by doing, creating work in a lab setting where they get immediate feedback. Work in the mid-20th century built on this, with Schön (1983) for example arguing that reflective practice is what characterizes traditional studio-based learning and makes a designer think critically to solve complex problem. One of my takeaways from that course was Schön's notion on the "reflective practitioner," which seems to effectively summarize pedagogy in design, informing the iterative practice and thinking process involved with traditional studio learning.

Yet, as design education itself started to change, so did the criticism of this broader model. Studio-based education was shown to help develop technical skills and creativity, but it has also been criticized for not providing enough broader contextual knowledge relevant to current designers such as user experience design, technological integration with design process and inter-disciplinary collaboration (Lawson 2006). Moreover, the apprenticeship model — which depends heavily on knowledge and expertise residing in specific faculty members — is prone to inconsistencies between educational quality and outcomes. This criticism began to lay the foundation for consideration of alternative instructional approaches that could fill these gaps without abandoning what was working in traditional methods.

Rise of Modern Teaching Methods in Design. New teaching methods have arisen driven by digital tools and the growing significance of technology in design practice. These typically make use of online learning platforms, virtual simulations and digital collaboration tools which stands in contrast to the traditional design education that is very hands-on and face-to-face. Technology is now becoming an inherent part of Design Education, and it has been a topic addressed fundamentally in the literature recently (Kolko 2018), being that there have voices advocating for design learning as craftsmanship at work hand to hand with modern demands from technologies.

In modern design education, one of the most important shifts was interdisciplinary learning. Instead of following the entrenched pathways which typically only home in on specific design disciplines, modern ways embrace interdisciplinary education — from computer science to psychology and even business. This cross-disciplinary focus is considered fundamental to educating students capable of handling real-world complex design problems which are multi-faceted and need an understanding of the human, technological side of designs (Oxman 2006). Institutions like the school at Stanford University have helped push this along, showing how even design education can adapt to address 21st century needs.

Besides, we must admit that many contemporary teaching methods take advantage of the fact the online courses are still more flexible and accessible. The growing availability of information online and in MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) has made it such that students can now learn design almost anywhere, demolishing geographical as well as economic limitations which have previously restricted the supply-and-demand chain for top-quality teaching within the graphics area (Brown 2020). Design is a field that traditionally has been the domain of elite institutions this democratization of education is particularly pertinent. Online teaching, of course, has opened access and made learning more affordable to motivated students who do not live near a college or university with an art program; however, despite the increased accessibility for both teachers and learners—compounding efficiency on each end—it is impossible at this time to exactly replicate hands-on experience in studio learning (i.e.: direct feedback).

Comparative Analysis of Traditional and Modern Methods. It is also important to understand that traditional methods and modern ones are the butter — not just teaching design. These methods, emphasizing hands-on experience and apprenticeship, are great at teaching the principles of design and techniques. When implemented effectively, this method results in creating a space for students to learn by doing and iterating based on feedback received from solutions. The immediacy of the studio setting between students and teachers also promotes an overall visual design critique/analysis view as well as understanding what design is (Cross, 2007).

On the other hand, contemporary approaches to teaching provide flexibility and accessibility; they can cover a wider range of subject matter. However right design methodologies use digital tools and online learning media to learn Design Analysis Graphic at a larger level, integrating perspectives from various disciplines into the curriculum. In this series, I will show how these questions align with contemporary emphasis in the design field (Oxman 2006; flexibility and ability to work across multiple disciplines) Similarly to the professional practice, digital tools are utilized in design education as well, preparing students with skills required by the industry.

Yet those modern methods can be hampered by not getting hands-on, direct mentoring. Online platforms can do a good job of delivering content, but they can struggle to recreate the hands-on feeling and live collaboration that define an in-person design studio. Second, a false economy of effort through over-reliance on digital tooling can distract from basic hand-skills like drawing and model-making that are still legitimate in other areas of design (Lawson, 2006). This tension between technological ability and craft is ubiquitous in the literature, which reveals confusion on how to best approach both within a holistic design education.

Synthesis of Findings and Emerging Trends. A synthesis of the literature identified several macro trends related to how our conception and delivery of design education have evolved over time. Probably the biggest trend is that a lot of these thought leaders are talking about blending traditional and new methodologies to provide more whole educational experiences. In many cases, institutions are moving towards hybrid models that leverage the best of traditional and contemporary educational practices — utilizing digital instruments for studio-based learning or creating online platforms to enhance practical components. Hybrid learning models have been shown to significantly improve student engagement, and ultimately help promote better learning results as they merge traditional hands-on techniques with digital tools of new-age teaching. Ramasamy, Ramamoorthy & Vijayalakshmi (2022) discovered that collaborative teaching model in engineering design courses resulted to an increase of both quality learning and student involvement (Ramasamy, Ramamoorthy, & Vijayalakshmi 2022). Similarly, the addition of design-based and project-based learning methods in software engineering courses helped overcome the challenge faced due to a gap between academic knowledge gained by students and industry requirements (Gupta 2022). In this hybrid type of course, we are looking at giving the student a solid education which will groom them both in creative and technical areas involved in design.

A newer design trend is centered on human beings and their use of a space, somewhat in the notion that Frank Duffy describes here. Design thinking, based on the importance of empathy, ideation, and iterative prototyping process (Kolko 2018), has turned to be a central framework for teaching design in different traditional as well as contemporary settings. It engages students to approach problems problem-solving from a design perspective and prompts them with both creative AND critical thinking in how applicable the Social Design way-of-thinking can be across many industries. Design thinking is becoming more popular, but it also broadly signals a return to interdisciplinary and user-centered agendas in design education as well as to the practices of contemporary designers.

Additionally, the literature points to a basic need for adaptability in design education. As the design industry, new technologies and methodologies continue to evolve rapidly; a modern educational program for designers must be able to integrate these changes also quickly. This adaptability is seen especially in digital tools and platforms, which make it possible to update the curriculum on an ongoing basis (Brown 2020). But how can these new tools be used to support the heart and soul of design, without replacing the essential elements of education?

Contextual Challenges and Contradictions. Despite broad agreement on the advantages of both, the literature also highlights a series of contradictions and challenges in standardizing existing traditional as well emerging modern methods. Although the traditional design education model is resource-intensive, it poses a few main challenges: However, this form of study is unfortunately very time-, space- and cost-intensive and for this reason difficult to open or scale. In comparison to

modern methods such as e-learning, which are less expensive, scalable but weaker in the depth and immediacy provided through traditional approaches (Schön 1983).

The paradox of the integration of technology in design education gives rise to another conflict. The polycentric, ever-changing qualities of physical sketching can be ideal for reinforcing this deeper understanding; relying solely on digital tools to ideate new designs and iterate upon them may result in a shallower grasp of design principles. There are various scholars arguing that technology would be an aid but not a replacement to traditional skills and the balance between digital and manual should be maintained (like Lawson, 2006). The debate outlined above between the studio-based traditionalists and their innovation advocates—reflects an unresolved tension in design education: what is the best way to educate students for a future industry that moves quickly, while maintaining engagement with fundamentals of craft.

Overall, the literature review confirms design education to be a complex topic and hence it highlights that an in-depth understanding is necessary which covers both traditional as well as modern aspects of designing. No doubt, traditional methods offered some invaluable benefits in terms of experience and mentorship, but modern techniques introduced with the evolution are far more flexible, accessible and relevant to current-world design practice. Clearly the best design education programs will be those that combine both, thereby giving students a grounding in what it takes to negotiate today's challenges from within while setting them on a journey which is timeless. To keep up with the field, current research and experimentation remain invaluable in sharpening these educational approaches so they may be more adaptable to students as well as adapt concurrently with their professional expectations.

Discussion. Despite the numerous studies on design teaching with traditional and modern methods, there remain gaps in research resulting from this dynamic nature of development and transition within design education. With design increasingly shaping a range of life—affecting realms from consumer products to various digital experiences—the importance for useful pedagogic approaches that prepare students for this diverse field is more urgent than ever. Nevertheless, as research has advanced there are specific gaps and inconsistencies that have appeared or were insufficiently covered challenging for further inquiry and innovation in the field.

Gaps in Longitudinal Research on Design Education. A major missing piece I see is a lack of longitudinal studies showing the lasting effect that these teaching methods have on duoing method students' success and flexibility in their careers. Although there is lots of research that has been done around the immediate outcomes related to different types of pedagogical approaches, such as student satisfaction and what they get out learning wise — very few have looked at how these sort particular educational experience could shape trajectories into careers down the track. This discrepancy takes on particular importance in the sense of how traditional and contemporary methods are equipped to prepare students for an evolving design industry.

Based on research, hereby referred to educational methods have different long-term performance effects of graduates in the career, and it depends on one individual character as a background profile or their path upon how they will meet after years. Jenkins, Jones, and Ward (2001) also found the ability to engage in active-learning methods during students' studies was associated with significant differences on career outcomes; the latter is indicative of lifelong learning now Jenkins, Jones & Ward. More recent research found similar evidence, emphasizing that actions developing the knowledge and capabilities stay longer after teaching provided by authors such as Alvarez-Gallego, Martínez-Marín i.e. (2018) focusing on long-term strategies of teaching in this context (Alvarez-Gallego et al., 2018).

For example, while a student might do well in the classroom with lots of digital design tools but what does this experience actually mean for her long-term career success within an industry where technological change is so fast that some skills may become irrelevant only a few years later. Without longitudinal studies, educators and policy analysts potentially have limited data to base curricula off or make decisions on education strategies with. Learning how specific approaches to

education play out in the long run could help reveal best practices for preparing students not just to land their first jobs but succeed over time and be adaptable within a rapidly growing industry.

Not only that, but the design industry is also an ever-changing entity with new technologies, methodologies and market demands evolving every other day. So being able to adapt and learn is becoming more essential skills for designers. There are only preliminary data on the effectiveness of educational measures for permanently promoting these abilities. Do students with a traditional basis of skills have greater flexibility to challenges they may encounter on the new every day? Or do those who have been educated in modern/digital tools forge an easier pathway through the changing landscape of design industry? These are important questions for which we lack sufficient quantitative evidence.

The Need for Cultural and Geographic Diversity in Research. A more significant gap in the current state of research is that cultural or geographic diversity—such as examining acupuncture specifically in a European country and Western medical models with US populations—is largely unexplored. This is primarily because many of the studies in relation to design education are based on research from Western institutions, which tend to have most voice and control over discourse. This focus can be limiting, as it ignores the rich and diverse histories of design education in other countries where differing cultural values, imperatives and resources may affect how teaching is imagined taking effect.

The design education which surely will undoubtedly relevant and effective in the practical projects when played well with cultural and environmental contexts. As Heine (2014) highlights the sustainability is taught at Clemson based on environmental factors; therefore, students should consider sustainable design into their built environment context behaviors. In noting how students within different cultural contexts have unique issues in life, the authors also place particular emphasis on ensuring that all instructional designs are culturally sensitive (Mills, Stefaniak, Luo & Glass 2020). Further examination of how traditional and modern methods are implemented and modified within non-Western settings may inform the extent to which these approaches can be applied globally.

A big part of why the craft tradition in design looks so different outside developed countries is because what passes for formal education there includes a lot more cultural heritage and process. Production can often be locally rooted, too –flowers are just one small example. For example, the principles of wabi-sabi in Japan can deeply influence design thinking compared to Western-approaches valuing polished-perfection and eternal permanence. Likewise, countries having a heritage of quality hand-made goods like in India might have more focus on traditional crafts and craftsmanship in the design education compared to those with mass manufacturing/industrial designing agencies.

Together, such cultural facets indicate that a common law for design education will arguably be less adequate on an international footing. But because so much of the current research is tailored towards specific countries and regions, little light has been shed on these essential cultural nuances. Generalizing the present findings to different educational methods is difficult; hence, more research on applying various education methodologies for cultural contexts may be necessary in order that these are included into a study of global relevance.

Balancing Digital Tools with Traditional Skills. Second, the literature suggests a contradictory relationship between digital tools and traditional design craft. Though the necessity of technology in design education is universally acknowledged, its role in balancing finesse with handcraft—a linchpin over generations at the core of almost all design disciplines—offers little by way of a consensus. This tension, so far unresolved highlights the requirement for further hybrid teaching model research to bridge both sides and equip students with appropriate technological along manual skills that are essential in navigating modern design landscape successfully.

The digital tools in design have transformed the field by supporting your ability to render, iterate and communicate on a new level. Some argue, however, that it is undercutting traditional skills like drawing by hand or model-making and other forms of craftsmanship. Not only are these

skills important purely from an aesthetic standpoint, but they also play a crucial part in problem solving and spatial thinking as well as having the ability to truly understand materials and processes.

For instance, architects designing by way of digital media may not be able to subtly feel the structural constraints against their designs and as such might introduce impractical or overly complicated solutions. Likewise, product designers with no material experience have often had difficulty working towards a realistic and manufacturable solution to the functionality of their products. Hence, the challenge is to show what are the best things tech can do for them without betraying their skills and craftsmanship to create balanced designers capable of tackling all challenges.

Future Directions in Design Education Research. From these holes and limitations, several perspectives and avenues for further research are warranted. There is a promising sign on the horizon, which are more resolved hybrid educational models and not just where code learning content gets periodization plus practicality of such traditional methods. Research may concentrate on how to adapt these models for syntheses in a range of design disciplines, across various student needs and institutional contexts. For example, research on how to most effectively combine digital tools within studio-based learning may help an instructor develop more comprehensive curricula which retain the tactile experience while also adopting tech-driven versatility.

In addition, future studies may wish to investigate how various pedagogical approaches affect student capacity for continued adjustment when using new tools and technologies. Such studies could encompass for example longitudinal research following graduates throughout their careers to see how effectively they have learned or are able to adapt skills as the needs of industry change. That type of research can help inform how we prepare students with the skills and understanding they need not just for now, but throughout their lives.

A culturally sustainable pedagogy. Another area that needs a lot of research is how traditions and local culture-based teaching methods can be used to teach design differently. With the widening globalization of our field, it has never been more important to understand how diverse cultural contexts may shape teaching efficacy. We suggest that research at the intersection of culture, pedagogy and design can enable new teaching approaches to reflect more inclusive learning methods which are flexible for diversity.

For example, research could investigate how traditional design practices of non-Western cultures may be incorporated into contemporary curricula without appropriating and erasing these traditions while also preparing students for a global arene. It could go on to study how students from different cultural backgrounds react to teaching methods — and thus tell us something about what learning-centered environments for underrepresented groups might be more inclusive.

Practical Applications and Recommendations. The findings of this review could not only be used from these academic angles, but also for its practical implications. Some suggestions: design educators should undergo lifelong learning to remain current with up-to-date technology tools and teaching methodologies. Our goal is for faculty to be able to contextualize the new methods within their knowledge of design practice as well as their pedagogical strategies, so that they can effectively blend them into traditional design education. This not only elevates the standard of education but also guarantees that our in-school students are receiving a consideration which is both recent and rooted to the root's principles of design.

They can also opt to gain a foothold in education by forming partnerships with top industries and then create an alternate curriculum that is closer aligned to practical. This could result in real world projects and internships for students, giving them the chance to experience working with what they were taught both through traditional modes & some via modern day education. Initiatives like these can help to connect the dots between academic learning and professional practice, creating a more natural move from student to pro.

This might take the form of joint programs with design or technology companies, in which students would attend class and work on actual projects under an industry professional. Not only would this enrich their learning experiences for these students but provide them with potential industry contacts and a better perspective on how the education relates to working in practice.

In summary, while information based on the existing literature can serve as a strong and valid base for elucidating comparability of traditional versus modern methods in design education; interesting terrain is still left to convene. To push the field forward, it is important that we take these gaps and conduct targeted research in their wake; practical innovations can fill them when a theoretical approach may not. The more the design landscape continues to evolve, the methods for teaching must change making sure that our next in line designers are ready enough to accept and solve future problems.

These dimensions of sustained design research, cultural relevance and the strengths/bias issues in digital vs traditional skills should be identified by educators to further add subtleties and complexities on understanding when do students learn through Design. In doing so, the domain of design education can continue its growth and transformation to best serve students in a new world full of challenges and opportunities.

Conclusion. In summary, this literature review has conducted an analysis on traditional and emerging pedagogies of teaching design from various dimension: learning strategies used by teachers at each paradigm, positive & downside impacts to students' academic experience and professional readiness. I've pulled out some of the highlights from our review to show that traditional approaches, which focus on craft skills and practice-based learning in design education (drawing/making), are still crucial for how we foster creativity as well as proficiency among design students today. Another key advantage of these methods is to encourage a very reflective, iterative process-oriented way in which and through this you can think about proper problem solving that leads absolutely take realistic design thinking.

On the other hand, digital technology today allows for highly accessible and flexible use of methods that are interdisciplinary in application — making many more likely to develop tools with potential relevance to practice. The use of digital tools, and the integration of multiple online platforms which allow content to be delivered in many languages has ensured that design education is no longer confined by time or physical location. And further, new models of design such as those championing design thinking and cross-discipline education offer the best responses to this changing face of what it means to be a contemporary designer; readying students for a future that continues transforming faster than ever before.

On the downside, it reveals major deficits and tensions in this research literature especially for example with respect to longitudinal approaches but also culturally sensitive teaching models additionally hybrid ways that combine favorable effects of traditional as well s modern methods. If the goal is to improve and progress in relation to design education, thereby allowing it limitlessly to adapt with time according not only academic but market wise student requirements then these gaps need addressing.

These results provide several recommendations for future research and practical action. Studies should also consider longer-term impacts of teaching methods to give insights as how educational approaches affect professional success and adaptability in the careers on design graduates. Further, research here on culturally responsive design education is necessary to articulate pedogenic approaches for a global classroom. Educational institutions may need to incorporate hybridized teaching models that combine existing methodologies with new-age techniques, so students learn the required practical experience and digital fluency for doing well in their careers. It is through these efforts that we shape the future of design education to equip tomorrow's designers with tools and insights as they face increasingly complex challenges.

References:

1. Alvarez-Gallego, Sergio, R. Martínez-Marín, and M. Marchamalo. "The Long-Term Impacts and Effective Teaching: A Case Study in Civil Engineering at the Technical University of Madrid (Spain)." ICERI 2018 Proceedings, 2018.

2. Brown, Tim. Change by Design: How Design Thinking Creates New Alternatives for Business and Society. *New York: HarperBusiness, 2020.*

3. Cross, Nigel. Designerly Ways of Knowing. *London: Springer, 2007.*

4. Gupta, Chetna. "The Impact and Measurement of Today's Learning Technologies in Teaching Software Engineering Course Using Design-Based Learning and Project-Based Learning." IEEE Transactions on Education 65, no. 4 (2022): 703-712.

5. Heine, Ulrike. "Teaching Sustainability in Design Without Greenwashing." Journal of Civil Engineering and Architecture 8, no. 4 (2014): 395-404.

6. Jenkins, Alan, Lynn Jones, and Alan Ward. "The Long-term Effect of a Degree on Graduate Lives." Studies in Higher Education 26, no. 2 (2001): 147-161.

7. Kolko, Jon. Creative Clarity: A Practical Guide for Bringing Creative Thinking into Your Company. *New York: HarperCollins, 2018.*

8. Lawson, Bryan. How Designers Think: The Design Process Demystified. *4th ed. Oxford: Architectural Press, 2006.*

9. Mills, Emily, Jill E. Stefaniak, Tian Luo, and Chris Glass. "An Exploration of Career Decision-Making among Domestic and International Instructional Design Students." TechTrends 64, no. 1 (2020): 79-90

10. Oxman, Rivka. "Theory and Design in the First Digital Age." Design Studies *27, no. 3 (2006): 229-265.*

11. Ramasamy, Vijayalakshmi, Suganya Ramamoorthy, Sumesh Kesavamoorthy Vijayalakshmi, and P. R. "High Impact Practices and Collaborative Teaching to Enhance Learning and Engagement in Engineering Design Project Course." Journal of Engineering Education Transformations, 2022.

12. Schön, Donald A. The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. *New York: Basic Books, 1983.*

Ibraimov U.K.[1], Raimonda Simanaitiene[2]

[1]*Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Senior Lecturer of the "Design" Department, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail:* usen.ibraimov61@gmail.com
[2]*Vytautas Magnus University, Professor, Lithuania, e-mail:* r.simanaitiene@gmail.com

PEDAGOGICAL TECHNOLOGIES IN CERAMIC ART EDUCATION

Abstract

The present study, therefore, addresses the integration of pedagogical technologies in ceramic art education by specifically evaluating 3D modeling software and virtual reality (VR) simulations that are combined with traditional hands-on teaching methods. Through mixed-methods inquiry the study empirically validates multiple narratives about these digital tools and explores their impact on students' technical skills, creative growth, academic engagement. In comparison to the control