Abstract

With history being an established course in design education and sparking creativity being one of design education’s primary objectives, questions arise as to: What forms of history teaching capture student interest? How can the lessons of history resonate with youth in ways that tie the past to the present? How can assignments spark excitement in students and engender a passion for the subject? And, where can faculty draw inspiration from in re-envisioning the role that history can play in their program and profession? Two interior design educators from the University of Minnesota share techniques, assignments, and pedagogies that respond to the above questions and help set a trajectory for both creatively teaching design history and sparking students’ interest and creative potential.

Going beyond traditional methodologies and discourses around the teaching of history, these educators take a unique perspective and strive for a diverse set of objectives. Employing techniques such as digital games and free-hand sketching, they challenge students to engage with the material first hand. By tying a design project into a history course, they present students with the opportunity to conceive of ways to bridge the past, present, and future. Infusing history classes with creative and critical thinking that encompasses and responds to pressing social concerns reinforces the meaning of history classes and makes history relevant to students’ lives. Through this sharing, the authors aim to spark a dialogue across the disciplines around the teaching of history and the renewed role it can play in design education.
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Introduction: History in Design Curricula

One of the few undisputable courses in design curricula, history has survived as an instrumental course despite changes in attitudes and approaches towards the past (Attoe & Moore, 1980; Swenarton, 1987). The central position of history in architectural and interior design education is reflected in journals devoted to the subject, societies, extensive scholarship and inquiry, as well as expectations outlined in both fields’ accreditation standards (CIDA, 2009; NAAB, 2009). In parallel, creative teaching is inherent in these visual disciplines, where novelty and imagination are used to grasp and explore the past as well as understand the unfamiliar (Boland, 2000; Jackson, 2005).
Given the many facets of architectural and interior design history that can be unraveled (from chronologies to design characteristics, ideas, and forces impacting designers—social, political, cultural, technological, environmental, economic, etc.), the challenges to those teaching history are many. The proliferation of books, articles, conferences, films, and other mediums available to faculty do not make today’s teaching of design history any easier than before. Questions abound: What forms of history teaching capture student interest? How can the lessons of history resonate with youth in ways that tie the past to the present? How can assignments and exercises be developed that spark excitement in students and engender a passion for the subject? And, where can faculty draw inspiration from in re-envisioning the role that history can play in their program and profession? With answers to these questions, faculty can enliven their material, strengthen student engagement, and reframe the value of history courses in students’ lives.

Part of the challenge of imbuing creative teaching into history courses comes from transforming established traditions of how to teach history and what exercises to employ in the process into ones that strike a cord with a student body whose diversity has reached unprecedented levels and for whom technological gadgets are almost second nature. Typical history assignments include investigating original works or even obscure historical buildings’ proportions, composition, use of the orders or decorative elements, etc. through papers and models that often adopt a comparative perspective—comparing for example the domes of Santa Maria del Fiore, Florence, and St. Peter’s, Rome (Shvidkovsky & Chorban, 2003). Yet, in this era of global interconnectedness, technological dependence, and innovation as well as emphasis on critical thinking and ethically responsible design (Fisher, 2008), a meticulous study of masterworks might not be the only avenue for reaching aspiring architects and interior designers. Critics, such as Creese note: “Novice architects should be permitted to move off into as many realms as their imaginations can legitimately command...To have the students correlate only one building type out of the past to their new assignment, is to leave them without the power of reconciling themselves within a much larger inheritance” (1980, p.11-12). Faculty have to re-envision exercises and pedagogies adopted, translating them into ones that account for students being able to take ownership of the subject and use history as a tool to find answers to questions that emanate from their own experiences and lived realities.

Additional critiques surrounding the teaching of history also relate what is perceived by some as a disconnection between history teaching and practice. In the North American system, the intersections of history and theory are strong (Jarzombek, 1999/2000). The debate that arises centers on the issue that, because of its ties to theory and the humanities, history “becomes ever more remote from the concerns of architectural practice” (Jarzombek, 1999/2000, p.489). Teaching in fields which are so closely linked to practice, design faculty are thereby caught in the struggle of having to define ways by which the ‘practical’ application of history lessons can manifest in exercises and assignments. This idea of bridging ‘learning’ and ‘applying’ has been at the core of design history courses and design curricula, albeit a difficult one to achieve (Morgenthaler, 1995).
Exploring ways to mediate between the two opposing polarities of what history can be about (theory or practice) is inextricably tied to defining the role of history courses. Attoe and Moore (1980) describe the two kinds of architectural history courses that have prevailed in design education: “One... studies buildings as expressions of the society, with a goal of making the student a better informed, more thoughtful person, better fortified for the making of his own decisions. The second... involves the felicitous presentation of routes into mines where there might be found a vast store of precedents and inspirations for the students’ own designs” (p.1). They go on to assert the need for an intertwining of the two approaches. In this paper, we contribute to the literature by sharing an exercise that leads to both outcomes: students being better informed about design history and finding inspiration for their own designs.

Apart from how history relates to practice and to design, an additional dimension of the role of history courses is also under questioning: how history relates to the present and the future. While the place of the past is secure in history curricula, some historians have called for an architectural history marked by a critical interest in the present as well as the past (Swenarton, 1987). Weaving the present in courses already overloaded with material that needs to be covered takes creativity on the part of the instructor who is called to broaden the class’s scope and expand the ways by which to instill in students the lessons of the past. Assignments that enable students to make a difference, like the one we will be sharing below, are a step in this direction.

Embarking on the endeavor of stimulating student interest through history courses has an underlying ethical element. Ethics are infused into a subject whose teaching can be the “means of readjusting the indispensable value systems, which can then be used by following generations” (Creese, 1980, p.11). As Otto (1982, p. 29) also notes, “For when the circumstance that contains history and architecture is honest, forthright, and vigorous, the interaction between them can be an ethical achievement, one with the capacity to possess architecture”. Additional questions that surface revolve around how can faculty guide students through what can be conflicting political or national agendas and their relevance to design history? How much should faculty push a student unwilling or uncomfortable with ‘differences’ in design—be those historical, cultural, social, economic, etc.? And, how do faculties members develop and execute exercises that might induce ambivalent feelings, anger, and confusion? Such transformative pedagogies, which imply a change in consciousness that will have lasting effects in ways that are recognizable by both the person and others (Clark, 1993), ask of faculty to critically reflect on their teaching techniques and knowledge of the subject matter as “the sincerity of their intentions does not guarantee the purity of their practice” (Brookfield, 1995, p.1).

As two interior design educators, this paper becomes a medium by which we can start a dialogue around expanding the pedagogical approaches to the problem of teaching history and stimulating interest, learning, engagement, and creativity. Our goal in sharing the three pedagogical techniques that follow is for discourses around the teaching of history to strengthen, becoming a forum through which the question of “How can we effectively teach history?” can begin to dissipate.
Stimulating Student Interest in Design History Classes

Stimulating Interest: Three Pedagogical Techniques

“History is not ‘what happened in the past;’ rather, it is the act of selecting, analyzing, and writing about the past. It is something that is done, that is constructed, rather than an inert body of data that lies scattered through the archives” (Davidson & Lytle, 1986, p.xix). It is this dynamic nature of history that makes it exciting for both instructors and students. As material that is not static or stagnant, but instead it is subject to interpretation and critical analysis (Flores, 2003), historical content can serve as the fertile ground on which creativity and originality can flourish, thereby turning the subject of history into one of interest for the students and the faculty.

Creativity, originality, and student engagement are often not among the course objectives and outcomes one would typically associate with large enrollments classes that heavily rely on lectures and PowerPoint presentations, such as interior design history classes. Guiding our approach to the problem of using history to stimulate interest and spark creativity is Margaret Boden’s (1990) premise in her book The Creative Mind, that “What makes the difference between an outstandingly creative person and a less creative one is not any special power, but greater knowledge (in the form of practiced expertise) and the motivation to acquire and use it” (p. 24). Pushing creative boundaries, we argue, must be grounded in an in-depth exploration and understanding of the issues surrounding the subject matter on hand. Although a discussion of research methods is beyond the scope of this paper, the techniques shared below will shed light on the connections among facets of knowledge, ways to acquire knowledge, and creativity and how all are used to both describe and push knowledge and originality to the next level.

Drawing from over 20 years of combined experience in teaching history, we have developed pedagogical techniques by which to stimulate student interest in interior design history classes. Here, we share three of these techniques: study tools that appeal to technologically savvy students; sketching as a form of engagement and reflection; and a semester-long project that challenges students to examine their role in the world and the difference they can make.

Prior to delving deeper into more detailed descriptions of the three teaching techniques, it is beneficial to briefly elaborate on the scope of the two courses from which these pedagogies are drawn. The first course, taught by Stephanie Zollinger, focuses on the study of European interiors and furnishings including furniture, textiles, and decorative arts. This course begins with the study of the ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Roman civilizations, the societies that introduced the classic idiom that consistently reappeared over the following centuries and established the framework for inquiry by which historical study is analyzed in this field. The framework is then applied to the evolution of interiors and furnishings in Italy, France, and England. The second course, taught by Tasoulla Hadjiyanni, focuses on the United States, covering 1650 to the present. The emphasis is on uncovering the interconnectedness of design ideas and how they can be appropriated or adapted to match one’s own culture’s aesthetics and needs. Exploring how design elements from the Orient, Europe, and Central America are used to create a distinctly American design identity, class discussions unearth the multiplicity of
factors that impact the design of interiors and furnishings.

Although a combination of teaching methodologies are used, including visits to museum exhibits, films, and guest speakers, the primary means by which material is shared with students is PowerPoint presentations that we have developed. The objectives range from sharpening design abilities by strengthening students’ design comprehension and skills through the study of historical precedents to creating responsible designs, fostering critical thinking, and learning teamwork. Ways to reach these goals are by: increasing understanding of the historical, environmental, socio-economic, political, technological, artistic, and cultural developments that affect the design and manufacturing of furniture and interior design elements; increasing understanding of the meaning of objects within their own time and across time; developing associations between the past, the present, and the future; increasing visual literacy of both furniture and interiors and through that increasing students' design stimulants and perspectives on possible solutions to design problems; developing a vocabulary for discussing and analyzing historic furniture and interiors; developing an understanding of the chronology of historical periods in design and the relationships between these periods; developing an understanding of craftsmanship, materials and technology as these relate to furniture and interior design; and developing the ability to identify the stylistic features corresponding to various historical periods and to make generalizations based on specific examples.

As a way to attain the above objectives and guide students through the process of discovery, lectures adopt a macro-to-micro approach, shedding light on the forces impacting interiors and furnishings as well as highlighting the work of masters and specific masterpieces, such as Palladio’s Villa Barbaro and Le Corbusier’s Villa Savoye. It is the following three pedagogies however, that infuse energy and excitement in these classes, engaging students and stimulating their creative potential: embracing technology, sketching, and making a difference.

**Embracing Technology**

“Tell me and I forget. Show me and I remember. Involve me and I understand.” Chinese Proverb.

The design history courses at the University of Minnesota are embracing technology by incorporating numerous computer games into their classrooms. The history faculty agree with research by Salen and Zimmerman (2004) stating that games are effective tools for learning because they offer students a hypothetical environment in which they can explore alternative decisions without the risk of failure. Thought and action are combined into purposeful behavior to accomplish a goal (Prensky, 2001). Faculty members believe playing games teaches students how to strategize, to consider alternatives, and to think flexibly. Educational games are argued to enhance learning, engage learners, and provide learning methods that correspond with students' learning styles (Martinson, Zollinger & Gardner, 2009). Different games appeal to different people. This appeal may be based in content, activity, or personal affinity for game playing.

Interior design faculty member, Stephanie
Zollinger, has developed numerous games such as flashcards, matching, and a Jeopardy-based game. The games are used to reinforce concepts that are covered in the textbook as well as in class lectures. For example, matching games are used to reinforce vocabulary and time periods. Several matching games have been developed to help students identify design motifs (see Figure 1), architectural elements, styles of furniture, interiors, architecture, and art. Students match images to appropriate labels (i.e. vocabulary terms and time periods). Matching games provide motivation by: a) the opportunity to be played repeatedly until success is achieved; b) immediate feedback; c) allowing students to be in control of the game; and d) enhancing student concentration. These are particularly helpful when terms taught are so ‘foreign’ to the students both in terms of the vocabulary and spelling. Given that the following history course relies on the knowledge gained in this first course, the matching games make the learning process fun and effective.

A game based on the Jeopardy format has been very successful as a way to review fundamental concepts for unit tests. The Jeopardy session is typically held the class period before an exam. To play, the class is divided into teams of two to three students each. Three teams are grouped with a designated “master of ceremonies” (MC). Subject headings parallel topics and time periods covered in class and outside readings. The game board is displayed via a computer projection unit. Each team, in turn, selects a category and a point value and must answer the accompanying question. This format makes it unnecessary for the MC to determine which team “buzzed in” first. Team members are encouraged to discuss answers among themselves, but a 30-second time limit is enforced. If the answer is incorrect, one of the other two teams has a chance to “steal” the question and the points. The team with the lowest point total has the first opportunity to steal. The team format is quite useful for a number of reasons: it doesn’t put the individual “on the spot” in front of classmates; it increases...
the chances of getting a correct answer; and the students usually end up teaching each other. Although some friendly competition arises during the game, it is important to shift the focus away from the competition and direct it towards the learning/review process.

Additional emphasis must be placed on reminding students that the purpose of playing the game is not to provide a comprehensive review. Rather, the game is used as a prod to initiate the review process by going over the basic concepts in the various time periods. Overall, students are enjoying the games and are constantly asking for more. By playing online games, students claim that they understand the history material better and retain it longer. Student evaluations also reveal that the technology-enhanced learning environment has a positive influence on student motivation, through factors such as novelty, curiosity, control, personal choice, and effort.

As in any learning situation, students are usually more engaged when they face a challenge that they feel they can meet. Therefore, the games are developed to reflect course content and various skill sets. If the task is too hard, the students will give up easily, and if it is too easy, the student may become bored. Students also benefit from games that become progressively more complex and difficult. Thus, Jeopardy is an effective game as it allows students to begin at different levels of challenge and gradually take on more challenge.

In summary, games can be a valuable part of an educational curriculum. As with all learning, students need guidance and opportunities to reflect on their work. Games need to be sufficiently challenging to engage students, and the level of challenge should be flexible, changing as students become more proficient. As students can attest, games are not just fun – they can be powerful learning tools.

**Sketching**

During lectures that draw from PowerPoint presentations, students in Hadjiyanni’s history course are expected to sketch the design examples shown. These sketches serve multiple purposes. First, they can be helpful reminders when students are studying for tests. Second, they can serve as a reference book that students can use later in their careers. Third, sketches sharpen students’ critical engagement with the subject because students are actively reflecting on which type of sketch to use to convey a particular idea, choosing from a diverse range of possibilities that include a whole piece of furniture, building form, interior, elevation, etc.; details, such as legs, feet, seats, ornamentation style, etc.; interior characteristics of buildings such as moldings on openings, mantel pieces, stair designs, etc.; exterior characteristics of buildings, such as massing, elevations, window types, railings, landscape elements, etc.; conceptual-type sketches that evoke the essence of a piece or the design ideas behind it; artists’ renditions, such as paintings and decorative arts pieces; and other elements presented (Figure 2).

Lastly, sketching as a means of note-taking allows assessment of a student’s ability to grasp the concepts being taught and a student’s comprehension of the design elements that make up the design shown. Assessment through sketching takes place both informally, during
class time, and formally via tests. For example, three students use the board to sketch images of the varying ball-and-claw foot types prevalent in different regions during the American Chippendale period. The rest of the class follows while commenting on what is missing or what the major differences are (Figure 3). The test builds on this lesson by asking students to use words and a sketch to relate one of these designs. An indication of the effectiveness of sketching in teaching concepts and ideas is the fact that, in spite of the level of detail and difficulty involved in this task, over two-thirds of the students in the class answer correctly. Through this exercise, students get exposure to the many facets of a design that they have the power to manipulate while creating identity and differentiation among pieces—from overall form down to the nails on a ball-and-claw foot.

Interacting with a furniture piece, an art work, or a building shown makes history ‘present’ to the student, connecting the image on the screen to their hand and ultimately their cognition. This process of engagement lends a tangible essence to a past that is now felt and reconstructed. The patience that sketching requires asks of the student to pay attention to detail that would otherwise be lost if the student relied only on words to capture the lessons learned. With a visual to carry home the message, students are better able to embed the material taught not in a ‘reproduction-type’ manner but in an evocative recreation of what the piece means to them, what stands out to their critical eye.
Making a Difference

As creating responsible designs and fostering critical thinking are among the history classes’ objectives, the courses aim to engender an understanding of the artistic, historical, social, environmental, economic, political, cultural, religious, technological, and intellectual forces behind the design and manufacturing of furniture and interior design elements. With that understanding on hand, students in Hadjiyanni’s class are challenged to consider how their designs and they as designers can respond to current forces and societal debates. Through a semester-long assignment titled ‘Design Manifestations Across Historical Time,’ students develop associations between the past and the present in order to plan for the future.

In teams of four, students select a design problem to study across time and propose a design solution that addresses current societal needs. The design problem can be a building type; an interior space; a part of building, like a window; a piece of furniture; a wallpaper; a fabric; a lighting fixture, etc. and the historical periods must fall in the domain covered by this course, that is, after 1650. Three team members study one period from the past while the fourth, studies the present. The openness of the assignment enables students to select something they are passionate about, stimulating their interest and engagement and challenging them to reframe the role of designers in solving present concerns.

As a semester-long project, this assignment has two parts: a) a paper-like part that relates the research phase of the assignment and provides students with the knowledge needed for an intellectual, sophisticated, and informed understanding of the design problem they wish to pursue and how others before them used it to respond to the forces of their time, and b) a design proposal part that includes key process drawings in the form of plans, elevations, sections, axonometrics, material selections, details, and other forms of documentation as well as rendered design development type drawings in enough detail to comprehend the design. In some cases, construction documents and models are also part of the final submission. Because of its design component, this pedagogical method ties design teaching to the teaching of history.

Apart from picking the topic on which they want to focus on, students are also encouraged to be creative and take ownership of how they will explore solutions to the design problem they identified. These can again vary tremendously, from spatial and material to artistic and technological. Serving as a catalyst for students to explore contemporary issues they care about and their historical evolution, these projects range from public art pieces, to web sites, and a desk design. An example is Scream for social change. Students studied feminism and delved into the lives of women who changed history. Reaching the present day, they were concerned with the ‘negative’ female images promoted by the media—i.e. extremely thin, anorexic-looking models. Looking at the role of women throughout history, they proposed a series of statues to be placed on Nicollet Avenue in downtown Minneapolis (Figure 4). Turned into public art, these statues would juxtapose ‘media-promoted’ body images with those of prominent ‘real’ women who would serve as models for a healthy and positive body image. Their pink color is eye-catching and their...
provocative casting is enhanced by them being unclothed yet non-sexual (Figure 5).

While responding to a similar call, the need to promote a positive and healthy body image among young women, another team employed digital design instead. For them, a vanity was seen as a vehicle for reinforcing the intersections of beauty and health (physical, mental, and emotional). A mirror transforms into a digital screen that includes links to updates on a person’s well-being, categorized as: my mind, my body, my spirit, and my health. Personalized for the user, 'my mark.com' keeps the user informed of everything, from news of the day to inspirational and spiritual direction as well as healthy choices. Being a mobile unit that caters to a transient population, the vanity can be transported as people move or change living arrangements (Figure 6).

In a more traditional approach to furniture design, members of a team were moved by news that Minneapolis lacked behind other major cities in high school students who graduate on time. This disconcerting statistic prompted them to investigate desks and their evolution. The complexity of such an undertaking was underscored by additional factors that impact school attendance and performance, among them the increasing numbers of students suffering from Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and the alarming statistics for children with autism. Cognizant of the special needs of these students, the team drew inspiration from Eero Aarnio’s Bubble chair, designed in 1968 Finland, and designed a ‘hanging chair’ that can double as a study area. With its ability
to move, this desk can enable children and teens with ADD and autism to release energy while still studying and be free from the ‘corner desk prison’. Apart from a writing surface, the chair-desk accommodates the technological gadgets children are accustomed to using.

Figure 6: Vanity with digital mirror helps reframe notions of beauty and health. (Source: Authors).

**Conclusions: Closing Comments and Implications**

Although a lot has changed since the role of history courses in supporting both the present and the future direction of the interior design profession was first questioned (Jennings, 1998), much remains to be done. This sharing of pedagogical techniques and exercises aims to continue earlier dialogues; revitalize energies devoted to re-thinking the role of history in design education; and foster collaborations among interested faculty. By rethinking the role that history can play in the design curriculum, students’ understanding of how the past relates to the present and the future will be strengthened. In these tough economic times, when employers value “the ability to innovate and be creative” (Zemike, 2010, p.3), directing all courses to the objective of boosting creativity and stimulating students’ interest, can also translate to better employment opportunities for graduates.

Developing new frameworks from which to approach a subject with deeply embedded roots can serve as a platform for new perspectives to be shared. What once was a traditionally white and male domain, history is now also taught by women faculty as well as faculty from non-western backgrounds. Scholarship on the unique takes that women and teachers from other cultures bring to the teaching of history courses would be intriguing and can illuminate aspects of history that were previously ignored.

Intriguing would also be the development of pedagogies that stimulate the interest of students from diverse backgrounds - ethnic, racial, and age differences are some of the variables that come into play. Assignments that allow students to experience the continuity of historical change and perceive design in a holistic sense and within varying contexts can be more meaningful to students from varying racial, ethnic, and historical backgrounds. The question of “Whose history is being taught?” has never been more pertinent. Concerns have long been raised about the Eurocentric nature of interior design and architectural history and the use of conventional understandings of the notion of culture (Akkach, 2002; Hillenbrand, 2003). Coupled with the need to engender students’ global and multicultural perspectives (Dutton, 1991), a rethinking of history’s breadth and focus becomes adamant.
With ‘capturing student interest’ guiding the revisions of design curricula, administrators and educators can search for ways to incorporate a broader and more global overview of historical precedents: the mosques of Isfahan, the towers of Yemen, the temples of India, Japanese and Chinese castles and palaces, traditional building types from Albania, and Mongolian yurts. Capitalizing on students’ travels abroad, international students or students from immigrant families, and students’ passion for another place/culture can be mediums through which to creatively expand students’ horizons.

In parallel, at a time when interdisciplinary inquiry is a driving force in the missions of many major institutions, another avenue of exploration would be to investigate the role of history courses and history itself in forming and sustaining collaborative partnerships. Such an undertaking increases chances that students’ interest would be engendered for those with majors and minors in different fields, particularly since at the graduate level, many students come from non-design backgrounds. Given that design schools often offer professional programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, explorations of what should be taught at each level would also enable faculty and administrators to propose a holistic set of objectives that builds on years of knowledge and exposure.

The lessons drawn from the above pedagogies point to flexibility on the part of the instructor being crucial for students’ engagement and interest to be nurtured. Technologically-based design solutions for example might have to be communicated via sample web pages instead of a model. Time must also be allotted for syllabi revisions and for the development of teaching techniques and exercises that capture students ‘in the moment’ and challenge their creative and critical thinking skills. Allowing students to fully engage with a subject/topic they believe in or have concerns about, makes the study of history relevant to their lives. At the same time though, it challenges the instructors to open their definitions of what history is and the role it can play in design education.

Fascinating opportunities to further the reach of history courses are presented with on-line course offerings. Being lecture-based and relying on digital imagery, history courses are among the most suitable means for expanding to a nationwide/international audience. Given the current economic climate and the need to attract more students, history courses lend themselves to serving as income generators and as vehicles for broadening a student body. How this would impact faculty’s ability to stimulate student interest would need to be redefined and new forms of relationship-building must be put in place. How for example, do you engage a student via cyberspace?

In closing, if design educators are to meet the needs of today’s students, strategies for how to engage these students in the learning process are essential. Hands-on learning activities, such as digital games and free-hand sketching can increase the retention and comprehension of course material. Opportunities to experiment with ideas, develop concepts, and integrate personal insights and interpretations into solutions that make a difference, can build in students the confidence they need to develop their own answers. We see this paper as a step in the process of re-framing what history can be
about and how it can be taught. With so much to be done and so many avenues to explore, we are eager to continue these dialogues.
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