Meaningful engagement between generations is considered an essential aspect of quality life in relation to learning and development throughout one’s life span. Extensive research indicates a substantial mediating role that physical environment can play in developmental function for young children (Evans, 2006) and therapeutic function for older adults with dementia (Marquardt, Bueter, & Motzek, 2014). Many empirical studies reported that social abilities of both young children and older adults with dementia were supported in environments with low social density, small group size, moderate levels of sound, and non-institutional ambience. In addition to these design attributes, another salient attribute, spatial enclosure, as an environmental factor may influence meaningful engagement between young children and older adults with dementia. Despite the growing knowledge in spatial enclosure, these empirical studies have been conducted extensively on young children and young adults; however little attention has been paid to older adults with dementia. While the results of studies on a single population are not necessarily of lesser relevance or value to other population, application of the results without credible evidence may adversely result in undesirable outcomes such as lowered satisfaction, maladaptive behaviors, or stress. Furthermore, its effect on interpersonal behavior appears to be currently indeterminant with inconsistent results especially on young children (See Cerruti & Shepley, 2016 and Stamps, 2009 for the literature on this topic).
Inadequacy in understanding how people from different ages perceive and react to physical environment may fail to achieve a desirable outcome of meaningful engagement as a developmental and therapeutic potential for promoting health and well-being. This study focused on an unexplored yet important aspect of social outcomes – use of social spaces (i.e., activity, intermediary, and miscellaneous) in relation to the amount of spatial enclosure. In particular, the main research questions were: 1) What happens on use of social spaces when physical boundary permits lesser visual and locomotive permeability during intergenerational activities?; 2) How do young children and older adults with dementia feel about interaction with the different degree of spatial enclosure?; and 3) What environmental factors or physical properties tend to foster or inhibit use of social spaces and meaningful engagements with people from different ages?. To answer these questions, this exploratory study used a quasi-experiment to measure the actual spatial usage in relations to the different degrees of spatial enclosure as well as semi-structured interviews, aided by a photographic simulation, to identify ideal physical design features preferred by young children and older adults with dementia. Findings showed that the semi-enclosed spatial plan had an influence on the children’s spatial usage but not the older adults with dementia who tended to confine themselves to the activity area assigned for seating regardless of types of the spatial plans. This study suggests that compared to enclosed spaces, open spaces with moderate degree of visual and locomotive permeability offers desirable outcomes such as spaciousness, control, security, and accessibility which would enhance the potential for meaningful engagement.
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ABSTRACT

The flux from STEM to STEAM has often created the misconception that art and architecture fit both under the “A” of STEAM. There is a substantive difference between art and architecture and all its allied design disciplines: an empathetic process. Empathy is what distinguish art from design, it is the intention behind the creative act. Without empathy, there is not good design. Empathy becomes a skill that while intrinsic to the discipline of Interior Design, it is not often taught. (Zingoni 2017) Design education has evolved in the last ten years to address the NCARB call to expose students to real life problem within their community (2014). This debate over both theory and practice, has been explored in studio as praxis. Most of this praxis is through community outreach projects that have shifted design students’ experiences from “designing for” to “designing with”. There is a substantial difference in the students’ and community’s impact when “designing for” versus “designing with”. This discussion presents the benefits of both type of studio teaching pedagogies, that include the users as both as passive and active players in the design process. Designing “for” becomes more relevant in the early years of Interior design education to remove the pre conceived ideas associated with interior design as only an aesthetic or “good taste” issue. Designing “with” has been introduced often in upper division to expose students to the complexities associated with the discipline from many different points of view including the users, administrators, financiers, etc. The article presents examples of undergraduate studios taught in Interior Design and in Architecture focused in
designing for the public good. It discusses the differences in the students’ learning experiences and the community experiences when designing “with” versus when designing “for”. Within both approaches the main question remains how education in design can make good to the public, either, by “designing with” or by “designing for”.
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ABSTRACT

Design education continues to be influenced by the apprentice model adopted from 1850 Ecole des Beaux Arts learning pedagogy and has evolved to what is known nowadays as Studio Based learning model (SBL). This teaching pedagogy is still the common format for teaching students in Architecture, Landscape architecture, Interior Design and other design fields. (Boyer and Lee, 1996) In most studio projects the client and users are a fictional character described in the designed problem, most studios have the ultimate goal to “design a building or space” and most of the time, the program is given as part of the syllabus. This teaching pedagogy remains a widely accepted teaching method to advance design innovation, creativity, and theoretical discourse. However, there are couple of recent reports and events that have challenge educators to re think the skills students need to succeed after graduation. First, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) asked universities to be proactive in helping students develop life skills. “We want to stress that values deserve special attention in this effort. The highest educational challenge we face revolves around developing character, conscience, citizenship, tolerance, civility, and individual and social responsibility in our students. We dare not ignore this obligation in a society that sometimes gives the impression that virtues such as these are discretionary. These should be part of the standard equipment of our graduates, not options.” [NASULGC, 1997, pp. 12–13] In 2003 the AIAs Studio Culture Task force report addressed the need to merge theory and practice. Over the course of
the last ten years the term “praxis” has been applied in studios as a way to integrate theory and practice working with real projects and real clients. Lately, the recession of 2007 have impacted hard the design disciplines, the way of acquiring projects changed and it became more relevant than ever before, to educate the public about the value of the design professions. All these suggest that we are witnessing an era of cultural and social change, where collaboration, critical thinking, innovation and proactivity are desired skills. This paper presents a teaching pedagogy applied in a Senior studio in which the faculty run the studio as an office to expose students to emotional intelligence and immersive learning. (Fink 2013) The studio worked in four different projects associated with the university infrastructure office at multiple levels. The collaborative and intra-professional experience exposed students to build capacity for team building and empathy while working closely with non-design stakeholders to explore the expanded field of interior design and propose a radical shift in the role of the discipline. The studio explored the role of interior design in four different approaches: (1) in the design process, (2) in exploring new taxonomies for higher education infrastructure, (3) in informing a Request for Proposal, and (4) in providing fund raising opportunities. The studio thesis was to explore how Interior design can activate Social Action and how this can be applied at multiple stages of the design process. The first task challenged the twenty-nine students to organize a dinner for all the studio to walk the talk to activate social action, followed by research about each project, multiple meetings with stakeholders, the design of the overall need and a design and built installation that could activate socially each of the existing sites.
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