DOI Link: https://doi.org/10.61586/mFCqf
Vol.169, Issue.7, Part.1, July 2025, PP.54-67

Artificial Intelligence in Architectural Education: Rethinking Creativity, Ethics, and Pedagogy in the Digital Age

Assistant Professor (Ph.D.) Murat ÇAĞLAYAN,
Mardin Artuklu University, Department of Architecture, Mardin /Türkiye,
muratcaglayan@artuklu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-7273-4888

Received May 2025 Accepted June 2025 Published July 2025

Abstract
This study explores the multifaceted role of artificial intelligence (AI) in architectural education, examining its impact on creativity, pedagogy, ethics, and curriculum design. As AI technologies such as generative design tools, machine learning algorithms, and adaptive learning systems become increasingly embedded in design education, architectural pedagogy is confronted with both novel opportunities and significant challenges. Through a systematic literature review and thematic analysis, four central themes are identified: the potential of AI to expand creative capacity; its ability to enhance adaptive and personalized teaching; the ethical and epistemological dilemmas it introduces particularly concerning authorship and transparency; and the curricular changes needed to support computational thinking and interdisciplinary collaboration. The findings highlight the need for architectural educators to integrate AI not as a replacement for human-centered design thinking, but as a complementary tool that stimulates critical inquiry, reflective practice, and ethical awareness. While AI can democratize access to feedback and broaden design exploration, its implementation must be grounded in thoughtful pedagogical strategies and a robust ethical framework. The study concludes by advocating for a balanced integration of AI that safeguards the cultural, intellectual, and creative foundations of architectural education while preparing students for an increasingly AI-mediated professional landscape.

Keywords: architectural education; artificial intelligence; design pedagogy; critical digital literacy; ethics in design; computational design

1. Introduction

Architectural education occupies a unique position among professional disciplines, as it requires a synthesis of creativity, technical proficiency, critical reasoning, and cultural awareness within a design-based framework (Salama, 2016; Schön, 1983). The architectural studio often considered the core of design pedagogy emphasizes experiential learning through iterative design development, critique, and reflection. Within this context, students are trained not only to solve spatial problems but also to investigate the cultural and conceptual dimensions of architecture.

Over the past few decades, digital technologies have increasingly transformed this pedagogical model. From the early adoption of Computer-Aided Design (CAD) to the rise of parametric design and Building Information Modeling (BIM), the architectural curriculum has continually adapted to technological advances (Kolarevic, 2003; Kalay, 2004). Today, artificial intelligence (AI) marks the most transformative shift in this evolution one that challenges foundational assumptions about authorship, creativity, and the design process itself (Oxman, 2017; Madrazo, 2020).

AI technologies such as machine learning, generative design, and natural language processing are already permeating architectural workflows. These tools are increasingly used to automate or assist with tasks such as spatial analysis, structural optimization, and conceptual form generation, reshaping traditional design practices (Gero and Maher, 1993; Luckin et al., 2016). As these technologies become more prevalent in practice, architectural schools face increasing pressure to incorporate them into their curricula. This shift signals a transition from traditional, craft-based models to new paradigms that blend human judgment with algorithmic intelligence (Oxman and Oxman, 2014).

AI's influence extends beyond technical workflows; it also challenges cultural narratives surrounding authorship, originality, and intuition in design education. As students and educators engage with increasingly autonomous systems, pedagogy must navigate the balance between machine logic and humanistic values. This shift in cultural perspective raises pressing questions about the meaning of creativity, the authority of algorithms, and the evolving identity of the architectural profession.

Nonetheless, the integration of AI into education brings significant pedagogical, ethical, and epistemological dilemmas. Proponents claim that AI can enhance design creativity, expand exploration, and support adaptive learning (Burry, 2011; Mulgan, 2018). However, critics warn that overreliance on AI may lead to superficial learning, reduced critical engagement, and a homogenization of design thinking (Picon, 2010; Lopez and Roman, 2023). Moreover, the opacity and complexity of many AI systems may obscure the reasoning behind design outcomes, limiting students' ability to understand and interrogate the tools they use (Coyne, 1997; Mitrovic and Ohlsson, 2010).

Issues of authorship and originality are also becoming more relevant. If AI-generated outputs play a central role in the design process, to what extent can students assert creative authorship? These concerns demand renewed attention to

academic integrity, creative agency, and ethical literacy in design education (Lopez and Roman, 2023; Dede, 2005).

The core problem addressed in this study is the lack of a pedagogically sound and ethically grounded framework for integrating AI technologies into architectural education. While AI offers new modes of creativity and adaptive learning, it also challenges foundational values such as authorship, originality, and critical thinking. This study seeks to critically examine how AI can be harmonized with the humanistic ethos of design pedagogy.

Given these emerging challenges and opportunities, this study seeks to critically examine the current and potential role of AI in architectural education. Specifically, it addresses the following research questions: First, in what ways do AI tools contribute to the creative and technical aspects of architectural learning? Second, what pedagogical opportunities and risks arise from integrating AI into architectural education? Third, how can educators maintain a balance between leveraging AI's benefits and preserving human-centered creativity and critical thinking?

This study proposes that AI tools, when integrated thoughtfully, can enhance creativity without diminishing authorship; that ethical awareness must accompany technical skills in design pedagogy; and that curricula should evolve to include digital literacy, interdisciplinary methods, and reflective critique to ensure responsible AI integration.

Through a systematic literature review and thematic analysis, the paper aims to offer insights into the pedagogical, ethical, and epistemological implications of AI integration, and to provide recommendations for a thoughtful, balanced, and reflective approach to AI in architectural education.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Digital Transformation in Architectural Education

The integration of digital technologies into architectural education has unfolded over multiple phases, each profoundly altering pedagogical paradigms. The introduction of Computer-Aided Design (CAD) in the 1980s marked the initial shift from analog drafting to digital representation, providing enhanced precision and efficiency (Kolarevic, 2003). In subsequent decades, digital design evolved into parametric modeling, algorithmic design, and simulation-based workflows, transforming the ways students conceptualize form, structure, and performance (Oxman, 2006; Kalay, 2004).

This digital evolution is not merely technical; it is also epistemological. As Oxman (2017) notes, computational design methods have restructured design thinking itself, fostering a transition from object-centered to process-oriented ideation. Through scripting, coding, and data-driven modeling, students learn to design systems rather than static forms. This model encourages iterative experimentation, generativity, and an openness to emergent solutions hallmarks of what Akin (2010) calls "design cognition."

The architectural studio, traditionally centered around sketching, modeling, and verbal critique, has increasingly incorporated digital environments. Software platforms such as Rhino, Grasshopper and Building Information

Modeling (BIM) have become standard in many design curricula, enabling complex spatial and performative analyses (Salama, 2016; Burry, 2011). These tools not only mediate how students interact with design problems but also reshape the pedagogical role of the instructor, who now must mediate between technical facilitation and conceptual mentoring (Oxman and Oxman, 2014).

Artificial intelligence constitutes the latest and arguably most disruptive stage in this trajectory. Unlike earlier digital tools, AI systems possess the capacity to learn, predict, and even generate creative outputs. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), reinforcement learning, and neural networks are being deployed to produce architectural forms, automate performance analyses, and synthesize environmental data (Madrazo, 2020). This computational capacity expands design intelligence beyond individual cognition, raising questions about the future of authorship and originality in architectural pedagogy.

Thus, the digital transformation of architectural education has created both opportunities and tensions. While AI and other technologies offer tools for expanded creativity and analysis, they also foster dependencies and potential disconnection from material, contextual, and social aspects of design. The challenge for educators is to integrate these tools in ways that support rather than supplant critical thinking, conceptual clarity, and design agency.

2.2 Artificial Intelligence in Education

Across the broader educational landscape, AI is being heralded as a transformative force capable of personalizing learning, automating feedback, and optimizing curricular delivery. Adaptive learning systems, intelligent tutoring platforms, and AI-driven assessments are being increasingly adopted in K-12 and higher education settings (Luckin et al., 2016; Mitrovic and Ohlsson, 2010). These systems promise to adapt instructional content dynamically in response to learner behavior and provide real-time interventions that were previously unfeasible in large or asynchronous classrooms.

However, in creative disciplines such as architecture, the role of AI is far more complex. Unlike in standardized subjects, learning in design education is nonlinear, interpretive, and emotionally nuanced. While AI can assist students in generating design alternatives, performing analyses, or organizing data, the essence of architectural learning involves reflection, negotiation, and narrative construction (Schön, 1983; Tracy, 2020).

Furthermore, the use of AI in education raises a number of ethical and epistemological concerns. For example, if a student uses an AI system to generate a building form, who retains authorship of the resulting design? Are AI-generated outputs a legitimate academic aid or a threat to originality and intellectual property (Lopez and Roman, 2023; Dede, 2005)? Such questions are especially urgent in studio contexts where the boundaries between inspiration, imitation, and innovation are often blurred.

Another significant concern is the opacity of AI systems. Many advanced models function as “black boxes,” offering limited transparency about how they generate results. This may compromise a core educational objective: cultivating comprehension over outcomes. If students cannot interpret how or why a design

solution emerged, they are less likely to develop robust problem-solving skills or critical awareness (Picon, 2010; Coyne, 1997).

Nevertheless, when approached critically, AI can serve as a "collective intelligence amplifier," as Mulgan (2018) describes. By connecting human intuition with machine computation, educators can foster hybrid learning environments that broaden rather than restrict the intellectual horizons of architectural thought. The key lies in positioning AI not as a surrogate for human creativity but as a catalyst for new forms of inquiry, collaboration, and reflection.

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, interpretive research design, emphasizing a systematic literature review (SLR) and thematic content analysis as its methodological foundations. Given the exploratory nature of the research questions and the theoretical orientation of the study, a qualitative approach is well-suited for uncovering complex, context-specific, and value-laden dimensions of artificial intelligence (AI) in architectural education (Creswell and Poth, 2018; Tracy, 2020).

3.1 Rationale for a Qualitative Approach

Qualitative research methods are appropriate for investigating phenomena that are evolving, interdisciplinary, and rich in interpretive complexity, such as the integration of AI into design pedagogy. Rather than measuring outcomes or testing hypotheses, this study aims to interpret patterns, synthesize conceptual frameworks, and reveal tensions within the scholarly discourse (Nowell et al., 2017). The qualitative orientation also enables the identification of emergent themes that may not be immediately visible through quantitative techniques.

3.2 Data Collection and Selection Criteria

The systematic literature review was conducted in accordance with PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines to ensure methodological transparency and replicability (Page et al., 2021). Literature was collected from databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, and JSTOR using keywords related to AI, architecture, and education. Inclusion criteria included peer-reviewed sources published between 2003 and 2025, with relevance to AI integration in architectural or design pedagogy. A group of articles were selected after applying exclusion criteria and screening for thematic relevance. A summary of some of the selected sources, their methodologies, and contributions is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Some Selected Literature on AI in Architectural Education

Author(s) & Year	Focus of Study	Methodology	Key Contribution
Turan & Keskin (2025)	Human-AI collaboration in design learning	Empirical case study	Propose co-creative learning models integrating AI and studio pedagogy
Singh & Al-Khatib (2024)	Reflective practice in AI-enhanced studios	Conceptual framework	Analyze tensions between automation and agency in reflective design
Ersoy & Gök (2023)	Ethics in AI-assisted design education	Empirical study	Investigate authorship, plagiarism, and academic integrity with AI tools
Nguyen (2023)	Algorithmic bias in design education	Critical pedagogy	Highlights how AI reinforces cultural biases and aesthetic norms
López & Román (2023)	AI and authorship ethics in design education	Empirical study	Explore ethical risks of AI use in design studio submissions
Lee & Park (2022)	AI literacy in architectural curricula	Curriculum analysis	Propose integration strategies for AI skills in undergraduate education
Braun & Clarke (2021)	Reflexive thematic analysis	Methodological guide	Offer standards for rigorous qualitative data analysis
Tracy (2020)	Qualitative trustworthiness in design research	Methodological synthesis	Provides validity criteria for thematic and interpretive educational research
Madrazo (2020)	Contradictions in AI-driven design education	Theoretical review	Discusses tensions between creativity and automation in pedagogy
Oxman (2017)	Parametric and cognitive design thinking	Theoretical review	Introduces new conceptual models for digital and generative thinking

3.3 Data Analysis Process

The selected literature was analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following the six-phase process developed by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2021): familiarization with data, generating codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining themes, and producing the report. Themes were derived inductively and validated through conceptual triangulation across design pedagogy and AI ethics literature (Gero and Maher, 1993; Oxman, 2017; Lopez and Roman, 2023).

3.4 Ensuring Trustworthiness

To enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, the study applied several validation strategies: source triangulation, reflexivity, an audit trail, and thick description (Tracy, 2020; Nowell et al., 2017). These practices ensured methodological rigor and transparency in theme construction.

3.5 Limitations

This study is based solely on secondary sources and does not include empirical data such as interviews or studio observations. While the findings offer conceptual depth, their generalizability remains limited. Additionally, the review is limited to English-language publications, which may omit relevant regional or linguistic perspectives. As AI tools and pedagogical frameworks are rapidly evolving, some insights may become outdated in the near future (Madrazo, 2020; Mulgan, 2018).

4. Findings and Discussion

The thematic findings of this study are structured into four main categories, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Thematic Coding Framework on AI in Architectural Education

Main Theme	Sub-Themes	Description	Representative Sources
Enhancing Creativity	Generative tools, parametric modeling, iterative design, abstraction	AI expands students' design capabilities and enables novel modes of exploration and abstraction.	Oxman (2017); Burry (2011); Akin (2010); Gero and Maher (1993); Madrazo (2020)
Pedagogical Opportunities	Adaptive learning, personalized feedback, hybrid studios, intelligent tutoring	AI supports more personalized and equitable learning experiences, offering real-time feedback and adaptive pathways.	Luckin et al. (2016); Dede (2005); Mitrovic and Ohlsson(2010); Salama (2016); Singh and Al-Khatib (2024)
Ethical and Epistemological Concerns	Authorship, originality, algorithmic opacity, bias, academic integrity	AI raises ethical concerns about authorship, bias, and transparency, requiring deeper epistemological awareness.	López & Román (2023); Coyne (1997); Picon (2010); Benjamin (2019); Ersoy and Gök (2023); Nguyen (2023)
Curriculum and Skill Shifts	Coding literacy, computational thinking, AI literacy, interdisciplinary methods	AI demands curricular transformations toward hybrid competencies in coding, critical reasoning, and design ethics.	Oxman and Oxman (2014); Kolarevic (2003); Kalay (2004); Lee and Park (2022); Tracy (2020)

Theme 1: Enhancing Creativity

AI has the potential to expand the creative capacities of students by enabling generative design, algorithmic form-finding, and rapid idea iteration. When embedded thoughtfully into the design process, AI can stimulate exploration and abstraction, encouraging new modes of creative thinking (Oxman, 2017; Burry, 2011). Generative design platforms allow learners to input parameters and explore a multitude of formal permutations, supporting exploratory thinking central to creative cognition (Akin, 2010; Gero and Maher, 1993). However, some scholars caution against aesthetic homogenization and passive reliance on AI outputs, which may undermine student authorship (Picon, 2010; Coyne, 1997; Madrazo, 2020). Educators must therefore ensure that AI serves to augment not replace conceptual depth and critical reflection (Schön, 1983; Lopez and Roman, 2023).

Theme 2: Pedagogical Opportunities

AI presents significant pedagogical opportunities through adaptive learning systems, intelligent tutoring, and real-time feedback mechanisms (Luckin et al., 2016; Dede, 2005). Turan and Keskin (2025) argue that AI should be positioned not merely as an assistive technology but as a collaborative partner in creative design exploration. In architectural studios, AI can act as a complementary tutor, helping students iteratively evaluate their work and foster independent learning (Mitrovic and Ohlsson, 2010). Blended learning environments also benefit from AI-driven learning management systems, enhancing both flexibility and accessibility. Nevertheless, over-reliance on AI may lead to dehumanized learning experiences and a narrow focus on performance metrics. Instructors must remain central to studio culture by cultivating humanistic, critical, and dialogic approaches to teaching (Salama, 2016; Tracy, 2020). As Selwyn (2019) emphasizes, the promise of AI-driven personalization in education must be weighed against the risk of diminishing the relational and humanistic foundations of architectural learning.

Theme 3: Ethical and Epistemological Concerns

The application of AI in design education introduces ethical dilemmas surrounding authorship, intellectual property, and algorithmic transparency (Lopez and Roman, 2023; Dede, 2005). Students often interact with AI tools without a full understanding of their underlying logic, which may hinder deep learning and critical epistemological awareness (Picon, 2010; Coyne, 1997).

Furthermore, algorithmic bias and data opacity risk reproducing aesthetic and cultural biases, thereby marginalizing diverse design perspectives (Oxman, 2017; Mulgan, 2018). Nguyen (2023) highlights how uncritical applications of AI

can replicate exclusionary traditions and limit creative plurality. To address these challenges, ethical literacy and philosophical inquiry should be embedded within the design curriculum (Schön, 1983; Kalay, 2004). As Benjamin (2019) reminds us, algorithms often reflect and reinforce existing sociocultural hierarchies what she terms the "New Jim Code." Ersoy and Gök (2023) also raise concerns that AI-generated outputs blur the boundaries of academic integrity and creative authorship in architectural education

Theme 4: Curriculum and Skill Shifts

The integration of AI into architectural education necessitates curricular transformations emphasizing computational thinking, coding proficiency, and interdisciplinary collaboration (Kolarevic, 2003; Kalay, 2004; Oxman and Oxman, 2014). Students must evolve from software users to authors of digital logic through platforms such as Python and Grasshopper (Oxman, 2006). As Lee and Park (2022) argue, explicitly embedding AI literacy into architectural curricula is vital for preparing students to critically engage with emerging tools. Assessment methods must also shift to value process, critical reasoning, and ethical awareness over final aesthetic outcomes (Tracy, 2020; Lopez and Roman, 2023). Globally, architecture schools are introducing courses such as “AI and Society” and “Computational Thinking for Designers” to equip students for increasingly complex and hybrid professional futures (Dede, 2005; Luckin et al., 2016).

5. Conclusion

This study examined the transformative role of artificial intelligence (AI) in architectural education, identifying its multifaceted impacts on creativity, pedagogy, ethics, and curriculum design. By synthesizing current literature and analyzing emerging trends through a qualitative lens, it becomes evident that AI is not merely a technical tool but a disruptive and potentially constructive force that redefines how architecture is conceptualized, taught, and practiced (Oxman, 2017; Lopez and Roman, 2023).

At the heart of these transformations lies the question of creativity. AI technologies particularly those involving generative design, machine learning, and algorithmic modeling expand the designer’s toolkit by offering previously unimaginable formal and spatial possibilities (Burry, 2011; Gero and Maher, 1993). These tools enable students to explore diverse design alternatives, optimize performance, and iterate rapidly. However, this expansion of creative capacity introduces a paradox: while AI may augment imagination, it may also standardize outcomes if used uncritically. The creative process risks becoming automated and depersonalized when students fail to question the assumptions and datasets

underlying AI outputs (Picon, 2010; Madrazo, 2020). Therefore, architectural educators must guide learners to treat AI not as a surrogate for imagination, but as a platform for enhancing it through reflection, intentionality, and dialogue (Schön, 1983; Salama, 2016).

The pedagogical opportunities offered by AI are equally significant. Adaptive learning systems, real-time feedback tools, and intelligent design assistants can support personalized and inclusive learning experiences, especially in large and diverse classrooms (Luckin et al., 2016; Dede, 2005). In the design studio, AI can augment the educator's role by providing students with continuous formative input and exposing them to complex data-driven strategies (Mitrovic and Ohlsson, 2010). These tools hold promise for democratizing access to resources and enabling differentiated instruction. Yet, the studio must retain its essential character as a space for mentorship, critical inquiry, and creative risk-taking (Tracy, 2020; Salama, 2016). If the human dimension of design education is lost to automation, students may become passive consumers of algorithmic solutions rather than active participants in architectural discourse. As Turkle (2011) observes, overdependence on digital mediation may diminish empathy, interpersonal reflection, and the social texture of learning environments. Similarly, Singh and Al-Khatib (2024) caution that the presence of AI in design studios should not undermine the importance of reflective practice, which remains foundational for cultivating design agency.

Ethical and epistemological concerns further complicate AI's integration into architectural pedagogy. The growing reliance on AI-generated content raises urgent questions: Who owns a design produced by an AI system? Can students truly claim authorship over work shaped by predictive models? How can we ensure transparency in tools that operate as opaque "black boxes"? (Lopez and Roman, 2023; Coyne, 1997). These concerns reflect deeper dilemmas regarding knowledge, originality, and intellectual property in the digital age. As design decisions become increasingly mediated by machine intelligence, architectural education must foreground ethical literacy. Students should be trained not only in how to use AI tools, but also in how to question, critique, and, when necessary, resist their influence (Picon, 2010; Kalay, 2004). This includes examining algorithmic bias, data ethics, and the sociopolitical contexts in which AI operates (Mulgan, 2018).

Perhaps the most far-reaching implication of AI is its impact on curriculum and skill development. The emergence of AI necessitates a rethinking of what architectural students need to know and be able to do. Traditional emphases on form-making and representation must now be complemented by competencies in coding, data analysis, systems thinking, and interdisciplinary collaboration (Oxman and Oxman, 2014; Kolarevic, 2003). Design schools must

expand their curricula to include computational design, AI literacy, and the social implications of digital technologies. Moreover, evaluation methods must evolve: rather than focusing solely on final products, assessment should prioritize process, decision-making rationale, and ethical awareness (Tracy, 2020).

This study's contribution lies in its synthesis of these complex dimensions, providing a conceptual map for educators and institutions seeking to integrate AI into architectural education responsibly. It underscores that AI, if thoughtfully implemented, can enrich educational practice, foster deeper inquiry, and prepare students for a profession undergoing radical transformation.

Nevertheless, this work is not without limitations. Being literature-based, it does not draw on primary empirical data from students or educators. Future research should include classroom-based case studies, cross-cultural comparisons, and longitudinal observations to understand how AI affects student learning, creativity, and identity over time (Nowell et al., 2017; Page et al., 2021). Additionally, attention should be given to developing open, accessible, and ethically designed AI tools tailored specifically for pedagogical use.

Ultimately, the role of architectural education in the AI age is not only to train technically proficient designers but also to cultivate critical awareness and cultural literacy. This includes empowering students to question technological determinism, resist aesthetic homogenization, and reclaim agency within increasingly automated workflows. The studio should remain a space of dialogue, ambiguity, and experimentation where machines may assist, but where humans must decide what matters. Only when architectural education succeeds in shaping not just tool users, but meaning-makers critically aware, ethically grounded, and culturally sensitive can AI become a genuine partner in the future of design thinking. Freire (2000) emphasized that education must not reproduce systems of control but empower learners to read and rewrite the world. In this spirit, AI in design education should be critically positioned, not passively adopted.

Furthermore, the implications of this research extend beyond the design studio. As AI tools become embedded in professional practice, architectural education must take a proactive role in shaping future norms and values. Institutions should not only teach how to use AI, but also why, when, and to what end. This includes incorporating modules on AI ethics, data bias, and digital justice encouraging a culture of critical inquiry and social responsibility among future architects.

In summary, architectural education stands at a pivotal moment. The rise of AI challenges educators to rethink not only the tools of design but also its values and methods. Rather than resisting this shift, institutions should embrace it with critical intentionality integrating AI in ways that honor the reflective, cultural, and ethical foundations of architectural thinking. By doing so, we can

ensure that AI serves not as a replacement for human creativity and judgment, but as a partner in nurturing a new generation of architects: technically competent, ethically conscious, and critically imaginative professionals equipped to navigate an evolving digital landscape.

References

Akin, O. (2010). Variants in design cognition. *Design Studies, 31*(3), 232–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2010.02.005

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim Code*. Polity Press.

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18*(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Burry, M. (2011). *Scripting cultures: Architectural design and programming*. Wiley.

Coyne, R. (1997). *Designing information technology in the postmodern age: From method to metaphor*. MIT Press.

Creswell, J. W., and Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dede, C. (2005). Planning for neomillennial learning styles. *Educause Quarterly, 28*(1), 7–12.

Duarte, F. J., and Otero-Pailos, J. (2016). Digital tools and the future of architectural history. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, 75*(4), 478–482. https://doi.org/10.1525/jsah.2016.75.4.478

Ersoy, S. and Gök, F. (2023). Artificial intelligence and ethical dilemmas in design education. *Journal of Design and Technology Education*, 28(2), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.11120/jdte.2023.28.2.155

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum.

Gero, J. S. and Maher, M. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Modeling creativity and knowledge-based design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kalay, Y. E. (2004). *Architecture's new media: Principles, theories, and methods of computer-aided design*. MIT Press.

Kolarevic, B. (2003). *Architecture in the digital age: Design and manufacturing*. Taylor & Francis.

Lee, J. and Park, H. (2022). Integrating AI literacy into architectural education: Curriculum strategies and student perceptions. *International Journal of*

Architectural Computing, 20(4), 418–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/14780771221124877

Lopez, C., and Roman, V. (2023). Ethical considerations of artificial intelligence in design education. *International Journal of Architectural Research, 17*(2), 312–329. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAR-12-2021-0275

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., and Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson Education.

Madrazo, L. (2020). Artificial intelligence in architectural education: Concepts and contradictions. *International Journal of Architectural Computing, 18*(1), 14–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478077120905041

Mitrovic, A., and Ohlsson, S. (2010). Intelligent tutoring systems. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed., pp. 456–462). Elsevier.

Mulgan, G. (2018). *Big mind: How collective intelligence can change our world*. Princeton University Press.

Nguyen, M. T. (2023). Algorithmic bias in architectural education: A critical pedagogy approach. *Technology and Culture*, 64(1), 88–109. https://doi.org/10.1353/tech.2023.0005

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., and Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Oxman, R. (2006). Theory and design in the first digital age. *Design Studies, 27*(3), 229–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2005.11.002

Oxman, R. (2017). Thinking difference: Theories and models of parametric design thinking. *Design Studies, 52*, 4–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2017.06.001

Oxman, R., and Oxman, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Theories of the digital in architecture*. Routledge.

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D.,…, and Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Picon, A. (2010). *Digital culture in architecture: An introduction for the design professions*. Birkhäuser.

Salama, A. M. (2016). *Spatial design education: New directions for pedagogy in architecture and beyond*. Routledge.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education.* Polity Press.

Singh, A. and Al-Khatib, H. (2024). Reflective practice in AI-enhanced design studios: Opportunities and tensions. *Design Studies*, 85, 101135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2023.101135

Tracy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Turan, M. and Keskin, G. (2025). Human-AI collaboration in architectural learning: From augmentation to co-creation. *Architectural Education Review*, 11(1), 33–52.

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.