

EDITORIAL

For over 40 years the Edinburgh Architecture Research (EAR) has been an expressive vehicle of the diverse interests and contributions towards research in Edinburgh School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture. It started as an in-house collection of working papers and has developed over the years into a strong peer-reviewed architecture publication with broad recognition within the international academic community. It is currently listed in the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals and Ulrich's Periodicals Directory.

The concepts of "Architectural Education" and "Educational Architecture" represent two central themes in architectural research. In recognition of the importance of these themes and the quality of papers submitted, the editors took the decision of publishing two issues simultaneously, each focusing on one of the two concepts. Accordingly, EAR Volume 34, the first of the duology; focuses on "Architectural Education" which refers to the professional practice of various concepts, theories and methods in educating students of architecture, landscape architecture and beyond. Due to the dynamic nature of architecture education and practice; new creative methods have been developed for teaching architecture and various tools are adapted to transfer knowledge and provoke students' creativity in design. Therefore, the need was felt to call for papers which could present some of the latest professional practices focusing on this topic. Hence, the contributions presented in this issue represent some of the recent developments in the field and illustrate the methodological, practical and technological nature of advances around this important concept.

The first paper by Holden offers a historical perspective on the evolution of Landscape Education in the United Kingdom. The paper identifies the challenges in the field and draws possible path for its growth in the future.

The next four papers delve into detailed practices of architectural education. Shtebunaev, examines the types, progression of linkages and relationships firstly amongst tutors and students, and then as they are reconfigured as external collaborators (clients) involved in the educational process. The paper shows how a community approach in live project settings can facilitate filling in the skill gaps and lead into better educational outcomes - ranging from enhanced designs to learning of soft skills. Following this paper is the article by Vrouwe and

EAR Volume 34, 2016
Edinburgh Architectural Research Journal
The Edinburgh School of Architecture and
Landscape Architecture
Edinburgh, UK
<http://sites.ace.ed.ac.uk/ear/home>

Luyten, which focuses on the effectiveness of experienced-based education in the context of construction education in Architecture, Design and Arts Universities. In this study, which compares various learning situations styles (such as trial-and-error and structured workshop approach versus teacher-centred training, inductive versus deductive approach), the authors report on students preferences, actual learning improvement, and outcomes of the projects. Hansen et al. then investigated the relationship between design conversation, architectural language and the design process. This paper highlights how a particular educational space influences creative consciousness of students. Design conversations demonstrate that verbal and non-verbal exchanges and face-to-face and hands-on-actions are needed for a change to take place. Next, Edlby describes the creative development strategies used by some leading architectural design institutes. In his paper, Edlby compares a wide range of methods on teaching how to think creatively.

The last two papers in this volume directs attention to the use of mobile and computer technologies in architectural education. Deniozou argued that mobile games are effective tools in architectural education. He examined two mobile games, one based on a constructivist approach and another one based on behaviourism and micro learning principles, and shows how each type of game is suited to a particular learning setting (classroom versus own learning). Finally, Örnek and Özer, introduced an evaluation framework that helps to identify the educational potential of computer games for use in landscape architecture education. They proposed examination of three criteria: visual, technical and instructional. Using this framework, they showed whilst some games can be used directly to enhance architectural education outcomes, other games may require modification to leverage learning.

On behalf of the editorial team, we would like to thank the Honorary Advisory Board for peer-reviewing all the papers submitted for publication in this volume of EAR. The editors would also like to express their heartfelt appreciation for the hard work of members of the editorial team; Sarah Borree, Laura Bowie, Scully Beaver Lynch and Nikolia Kartalou.

Reyhaneh Mozaffar
Meshack Efeoma
Editors