PIONEER
ACADEMIC PUBLISHING LIMITED

Studies in Art and Architecture
ISSN 2958-1540
www.pioneerpublisher.com/SAA
Volume 4 Number 3 June 2025

Algorithmic Templates Influence Aesthetic Decision-Making in Korean Visual Communication Curricula

Daehyun Jeong[1]

[1] Kyung Hee University, Suwon, South Korea
Correspondence: Daehyun Jeong, Kyung Hee University, Suwon, South Korea.

doi:10.56397/SAA.2025.06.05

Abstract

This study examines how algorithmic design templates influence aesthetic decision-making within Korean visual communication programs. As educational institutions align their curricula with industry demands and digital design tools, students increasingly rely on pre-structured visual systems embedded in platforms such as Figma, Adobe XD, and Canva. Through comparative curriculum analysis, portfolio audits, and interviews with students and faculty at leading Korean art universities, this research reveals a shift from intuitive, exploratory design toward system-driven visual logic. While templates offer efficiency and professional polish, they also contribute to a homogenization of student work and a narrowing of conceptual inquiry. The paper argues for a redefinition of visual literacy that accounts for procedural authorship and critical engagement with automated design environments. It concludes by proposing pedagogical strategies that balance technical fluency with aesthetic experimentation in the computational era.

Keywords: visual communication education, algorithmic design, aesthetic standardization, Korean design curricula, creative automation, design pedagogy, student expression, visual literacy

1. Introduction

Visual communication education in South Korea has undergone a dynamic transformation over the past two decades, adapting rapidly to the demands of a globalized creative industry increasingly mediated by digital platforms and computational design tools. Korean art and design universities, such as Hongik University, Seoul National University, and Korea National University of Arts, have long held reputations for producing technically proficient designers, yet their pedagogical strategies have shifted notably from craftsmanship-based curricula to technology-oriented design thinking models.

This evolution is directly tied to the structural alignment between higher education and South Korea's highly digitized design economy. Government-driven initiatives like the "Creative Korea" policy and private sector investment in UX/UI, motion graphics, and media arts have fostered a learning environment in which software proficiency, adaptability to algorithm-driven systems, and digital portfolio development are prioritized. For instance, the Korea Creative Content Agency (KOCCA) has collaborated with universities to build

industry-linked programs that emphasize the commercialization of digital design assets, including branded motion templates and platform-specific content.

The institutional goals of visual communication education now encompass not only the traditional tenets of visual literacy and composition but also fluency in using tools such as Adobe XD, After Effects, and generative AI-assisted design systems. This marks a pedagogical convergence with global market requirements, where creative agility and algorithmic adaptability are increasingly treated as core competencies for employability. Moreover, curriculum updates frequently reflect this emphasis; design studio courses often embed platform constraints (e.g., Instagram grid systems, YouTube thumbnail optimization) as part of the project brief, subtly reinforcing a template-based visual language as normative.

As a result, visual communication departments are not only producing graduates fluent in design software but are also embedding a professional logic that aligns visual output with algorithmic preferences and social media trends. This institutional reorientation creates fertile ground for examining how algorithmic templates shape not only visual decisions but also broader aesthetic ideologies among emerging Korean designers.

2. Transition from Analog Skills to Digital Aesthetic Practices

South Korean visual communication education has shifted decisively in the past decade from analog-based studio traditions to digitally-mediated and platform-sensitive workflows. While this transformation reflects global shifts in creative economies, it is uniquely intensified by Korea's high-speed digital infrastructure, media-saturated youth culture, and policy emphasis on creative industry acceleration. In this context, design education no longer merely teaches principles of form and function—it trains students to operate fluently within algorithm-driven environments.

2.1 Integration of Generative Tools in Studio Instruction

Digital tools like Figma, Adobe XD, and Canva are now introduced in the early semesters of visual communication curricula. Their features—including auto-layout, plugin-based component libraries, responsive grids, and template-based starting points—are presented not only as time-saving aids but also as professional standards. As a result, students internalize these systems as both aesthetic models and procedural norms. The use of generative algorithms, such as color-harmony detection or typographic scaling engines, further embeds computational logic into student decision-making.

One studio instructor at Hongik University described how design critiques have evolved: "Instead of discussing spatial tension or typographic weight, students ask whether the UI component is 'industry compatible.' They talk more like junior UX consultants than experimental designers." In a comparative survey conducted across five Korean universities (N=130 students), over 72% agreed with the statement: *"Using templates helps me align with the expectations of clients and recruiters."* While such alignment may enhance professional readiness, it also reinforces formulaic visual approaches, especially when these tools are introduced without critical frameworks.

2.2 Decline of Manual and Intuitive Design Modes

This digital migration has also marginalized traditional design modalities. Sketching, collaging, storyboarding, and physical prototyping—once foundational methods for idea development—are increasingly seen by students as inefficient or outdated. In portfolio reviews and thesis presentations, physical processes are often included as post-rationalized documentation rather than genuine steps in the ideation process.

A faculty report from Ewha Womans University (2023) noted that fewer than 10% of final-year students used analog sketching as part of their process documentation, compared to 56% in 2015. Students often explain this shift in terms of "client expectations" or "platform constraints," indicating a perceived pressure to maximize production speed and visual consistency.

Yet the decline of intuitive methods has educational consequences. Analog processes allow for error, discovery, and lateral thinking—capacities that algorithmic design environments often suppress. As generative tools present optimized solutions instantly, students are less likely to engage in iteration or speculative play. The tactile feedback of paper, the serendipity of collage, or the spatial ambiguity of rough sketches—these affordances are difficult to replicate digitally, and their

absence narrows the designer's experiential range.

Moreover, the pedagogical language has shifted. The once-common terms "improvisation," "materiality," and "visual experimentation" are now often replaced by "efficiency," "platform compatibility," and "engagement metrics." This transformation in discourse reflects a deeper change in what is valued: the process is no longer a space of exploration but a pipeline toward polish. A senior lecturer at Korea National University of Arts described this as "the industrialization of imagination"—a process by which creativity is parsed into repeatable, legible units fit for screens, templates, and algorithms.

Taken together, these trends suggest that the shift from analog to digital is not just technical, but epistemological. It redefines what counts as knowledge in design, what forms of labor are visible or valued, and how students come to see themselves—not as authors of visual language, but as operators within pre-defined systems of production.

3. Function and Impact of Algorithmic Templates in Design Tools

3.1 Standardization of Layout and Visual Grammar

Algorithmic templates in design software have become more than just functional aids—they now constitute the scaffolding upon which much of visual education rests. In platforms such as Adobe XD, Canva, and Figma, templates embed "best practices" into the user experience through suggested font pairings, grid alignment constraints, modular layout schemes, and even AI-driven color harmonies. While these features serve to streamline design processes, they also codify a particular set of aesthetic expectations.

For example, in a curriculum analysis of six Korean universities with nationally ranked visual communication programs (Hongik, Ewha Womans, Konkuk, Seoul Institute of the Arts, Kyung Hee, and Dongduk), we found that five out of six course syllabi explicitly incorporated platform design modules that teach layout using templates. Design assignments were often scoped within mobile-first resolutions (e.g., 1080x1920 pixels for vertical interfaces) and made reference to industry-aligned software presets.

This template-based alignment leads to a predictable convergence in student work. In a 2023 portfolio showcase at Seoul National University of Science and Technology, for example, 77% of showcased branding or app interface projects used symmetrical grid compositions with centered call-to-action buttons and minimalistic pastel color schemes—visual decisions that mirror default settings in Figma and Canva.

Students often see these aesthetic norms as markers of "industry-readiness." However, this emphasis on norm compliance diminishes visual variety. One instructor from Korea National University of Arts observed, "Even the students with the strongest conceptual ideas tend to retreat to template structures in their layouts. It's hard to tell who really has a voice in their work anymore."

The result is a flattening of design vernacular. While these tools provide a shared starting point, they also narrow the horizon of what is considered "good" design, making originality harder to cultivate and recognize in the academic context.

3.2 Creative Limitations Introduced by Pre-Structured Outputs

The increased dependence on algorithmic templates has also led to conceptual shortcuts in the design process. Instead of engaging in traditional ideation techniques—storyboarding, freehand sketching, iterative critique cycles—many students now begin their design work by selecting and modifying pre-made templates. This front-loads polish into the process but back-loads conceptual thinking, if it happens at all.

A semi-structured interview series with 18 undergraduate students from Konkuk and Dongduk Women's University revealed that 15 of them began their portfolio projects with template selection, only adding creative layers later in the process. Students cited time efficiency and aesthetic confidence as the main reasons: "It looks clean right away," said one sophomore. "So I feel more secure showing it to my professor."

However, this can lead to design without authorship. Projects built on templates often fail to reflect a personal or cultural voice. One final-year critique session documented by a faculty panel at Ewha Womans University noted that while student work was "technically seamless," it was also "visually interchangeable and emotionally neutral."

Even more critically, this reliance on automated visual structure makes it harder for students to explain their design rationale. Without an understanding of underlying compositional logic, students often describe their choices in terms of software behaviors rather than creative intentions: "The button looked better on the bottom because Canva moved it there automatically," one student explained in a portfolio review.

In this sense, algorithmic templates not only limit diversity of output but also erode the reflective habits that design education seeks to instill. As design becomes increasingly automated, the role of critical pedagogy becomes urgent: how to teach students not just to use tools effectively, but to question the invisible decisions those tools make for them.

4. Curriculum Patterns across Leading Art Institutions

The pedagogical embrace of algorithmic design in Korea's top art institutions is neither incidental nor uniform—it reflects a strategic recalibration of curricula in response to global industry trends and domestic policy pressures. While universities still differ in the degree to which they integrate templates and automation, a comparative review reveals converging patterns in how algorithmic tools are embedded in instructional design, particularly in project-based courses.

4.1 Comparison of Template-Based Instruction in Top Korean Universities

Leading design institutions such as Hongik University, Seoul Institute of the Arts, Ewha Womans University, and Konkuk University have all adopted curricular models that foreground efficiency, cross-platform compatibility, and design system thinking. While traditional courses in typography and visual systems remain, they are increasingly supplemented—or replaced—by modules focused on UI/UX workflows, platform-optimized branding, and AI-augmented creativity.

For instance, Hongik's Department of Visual Communication includes a course titled *"Digital Editorial Systems"*, which introduces students to grid-based layout engines using Adobe InDesign and Figma templates. Meanwhile, Ewha's *"Smart Interface Design"* incorporates heuristic testing and plugin-based visual generation as core assignments. Even institutions with a historically analog orientation, such as the Korea National University of Arts, now require basic proficiency in algorithmic composition tools before third-year studio enrollment.

This structural shift is not limited to elective courses. In many programs, final-year capstone projects are expected to demonstrate platform viability, often assessed through metrics like responsiveness across devices, component scalability, and "user-centered logic"—all features that favor template-driven processes.

4.2 Frequency and Depth of Algorithmic System Usage in Project Briefs

An analysis of 40 project briefs from upper-year design studios at Hongik, Dongduk Women's University, and Kyung Hee University (2021–2023) shows that 87% explicitly mention or require the use of design systems or templates. These briefs often encourage students to "build scalable interfaces," "apply consistent typographic grids," or "work within a real-time brand system"—phrases that implicitly privilege algorithmic regularity over experimental composition.

Moreover, in collaborative modules—such as branding workshops run jointly with tech companies like Naver or Kakao—students are often guided toward toolkits that use AI-generated suggestions or layout prediction models. These industry-linked pedagogies not only normalize template reliance but also valorize automation as part of creative professionalism.

Some faculty members defend this model as a pragmatic adaptation to the realities of commercial practice. As one professor from Konkuk University remarked, "No one builds from scratch anymore. We teach students to plug in, adapt fast, and meet the brief." Yet others warn that this emphasis erodes the formative values of experimentation, iteration, and critical form-making. The curriculum, in this view, is drifting toward production logic rather than educational discovery.

The result is a paradox: while students gain fluency in the tools of contemporary design, they risk internalizing a limited view of creativity—one that confuses technical polish with conceptual depth, and platform optimization with visual authorship.

5. Shifts in Student Expression and Visual

Identity Formation

As algorithmic design environments become normalized in visual communication curricula, students' modes of expression and processes of visual identity formation have begun to shift in both subtle and visible ways. The once-celebrated studio culture of intuitive mark-making, expressive typography, and personal authorship is now gradually recalibrated toward a design logic governed by optimization, system consistency, and platform legibility.

These shifts are perhaps most evident in how student portfolios and final-year exhibitions have evolved. A comparative visual audit of 120 student portfolios (2018–2023) from Hongik University, Ewha Womans University, and Kyung Hee University reveals a growing uniformity in aesthetic output. Key patterns include the frequent use of modular grid structures, pastel-based UI palettes, and flat, vectorized icon systems—elements commonly embedded in software templates. Even among students working on different topics or industries, the underlying visual grammar appears increasingly similar. The outputs look "clean" and "professional," but also derivative and visually indistinct.

This aesthetic convergence suggests a redefinition of what it means to "develop a personal style." Students today tend to equate identity with interface fluency—knowing which design system to apply for a specific brand or platform—rather than developing idiosyncratic visual signatures. Their creative choices are often driven by what performs well on digital screens and within algorithmically sorted environments (e.g., Behance, Instagram, TikTok portfolios). Some students even describe their design ethos in terms of "target engagement" or "scroll-stopping clarity," indicating a deeper alignment with digital marketing logics than with traditional notions of design originality or experimentation.

In interviews, students often articulate their process using phrases like "this component works well on mobile" or "the hierarchy fits what users expect." While this reflects strong professional awareness, it also signals a departure from exploratory visual thinking. Expression is increasingly mediated through platform fluency, and selfhood in design is narrated not through visual rebellion or improvisation, but through frictionless, high-function output.

Nevertheless, some students resist the template logic. A small but notable subset of students—often those with a background in fine arts or typography—intentionally deviate from clean systems by using hand-rendered type, glitch aesthetics, or asymmetrical composition to reclaim a sense of authorship. Their work may appear less polished in a software sense, but it foregrounds ambiguity, risk, and personal voice. However, these students often face institutional pressure to "clean up" their designs for portfolio reviews or industry showcases, suggesting that even acts of aesthetic resistance are ultimately filtered through the system they challenge.

In this emergent ecosystem, visual identity is no longer anchored in form-making as exploration, but in system navigation as optimization. The creative self is increasingly shaped not by how it deviates from structure, but by how well it operates within one. This marks a critical moment for educators and institutions to reflect: what kinds of designers are we producing, and at what cost to diversity of expression?

6. Educators' Reflections on Creativity and Automation

As algorithmic design tools increasingly shape the aesthetics, structure, and pace of visual communication education, Korean design educators are actively reflecting on their pedagogical responsibilities. While many acknowledge the efficiency and professional alignment offered by templates and automated systems, there is growing concern over their long-term impact on students' creative development. Faculty across multiple institutions express tension between preparing students for industry-standard workflows and preserving the conceptual and expressive depth that defines a holistic design education.

6.1 Concerns about Homogenization of Student Output

One of the most frequently cited concerns among educators is the visible homogenization of student work. Instructors report that final submissions often share strikingly similar layouts, typographic hierarchies, and color palettes—regardless of thematic or disciplinary variation. This convergence is not accidental; it is the aesthetic consequence of designing within identical systems, often using identical tools.

A senior professor at Hongik University remarked during a 2022 portfolio review: "Even when students work on entirely different briefs, their visual solutions look algorithmically 'solved.' The grid is always clean, the interface flat, and the typography interchangeable. We're losing a sense of visual personality." Faculty at Korea National University of Arts similarly noted that critiques now often revolve around optimization rather than expression: is the layout responsive, the component scalable, the UI clean?

Such tendencies raise fundamental pedagogical questions. When students rely heavily on automation to fulfill visual expectations, their conceptual development may atrophy. There's little incentive to question compositional norms when templates provide optimized defaults that are institutionally and commercially rewarded.

6.2 Strategies for Maintaining Conceptual Rigor in Design Process

In response, some instructors are designing interventions to re-center conceptual thinking and process-oriented pedagogy. These strategies include requiring analog iterations during early project phases, incorporating speculative briefs that resist systematization, and introducing "template disruption" modules that explicitly challenge algorithmic defaults.

For instance, at Ewha Womans University, one studio course mandates that students complete at least three analog prototypes—sketched, collaged, or materially constructed—before translating ideas into digital form. Another course at Kyung Hee University asks students to reverse-engineer a Canva template, identifying its aesthetic logic and then "breaking" it through narrative inversion, asymmetry, or analog distortion.

Educators are also re-emphasizing reflective critique. Instead of focusing solely on whether a design is platform-ready, instructors prompt students to articulate their visual reasoning: Why was this typeface chosen? How does this layout reflect your idea rather than the system's suggestion? These questions redirect attention from polish to purpose, from system efficiency to aesthetic ownership.

Despite these efforts, challenges remain. Many students still prioritize "portfolio compatibility" over experimental risk, especially under job market pressure. Faculty note that while some conceptual strategies succeed in studio, they are often abandoned when students prepare final portfolios for industry reviewers. The contradiction is sharp: institutions strive to foster independent thinkers, yet reward outputs that conform to commercial logics.

Educators thus walk a fine line. They must teach students to operate fluently within algorithmic environments while protecting the creative ambiguity essential to long-term design growth. It is a balancing act between empowerment and resistance—between the precision of the template and the unpredictability of imagination.

7. Student Attitudes toward Algorithm-Guided Creation

As algorithmic tools become integral to visual communication education, student attitudes toward these systems reveal both practical enthusiasm and growing conceptual ambivalence. While most students appreciate the productivity gains offered by templated workflows, they also express frustration over creative constraints and aesthetic repetition. These perspectives are not uniform, however; they vary significantly across specializations, experience levels, and underlying design values.

7.1 Perceived Advantages and Frustrations with Templated Workflows

Across undergraduate design programs in Korea, algorithm-guided creation is widely seen by students as a fast track to professional-looking work. In focus groups conducted at Ewha Womans University and Konkuk University (2023), students consistently emphasized the time efficiency of design templates. As one junior stated, "Figma saves me hours I'd normally spend aligning things. I can just focus on what the professor wants." Another noted, "I feel more confident submitting something that looks 'industry standard,' even if it's not super original."

Templated workflows also reduce decision fatigue, especially for students still developing formal fluency. They provide a safe structure for those who may lack the confidence or vocabulary to experiment independently. The ability to quickly iterate and produce polished digital outcomes is particularly valuable in fast-paced studio settings or in courses with short turnaround deadlines.

However, this reliance often leads to creative stagnation. Many students express discomfort

with how templated systems narrow their options. "Sometimes I just scroll through Canva layouts endlessly and pick the one that looks least generic," said one sophomore at Kyung Hee University. Others described the tools as "too clean," "too rigid," or "too flat," noting that deviation often leads to visually incoherent results. There is also a recurring theme of self-doubt—students question whether their creative voice is truly theirs or simply the result of guided automation.

7.2 Differentiation by Specialization, Experience, and Design Values

These attitudes are further differentiated by students' disciplinary focus. UI/UX and digital branding students are the most receptive to algorithmic systems, seeing them as essential for portfolio alignment and employability. They emphasize client-readiness, efficiency, and design system fluency. One senior specializing in interface design explained, "The first thing recruiters ask is if you can use Figma. No one cares about sketches."

By contrast, students in graphic arts, motion graphics, or experimental typography tend to be more skeptical of templated workflows. For them, templates represent constraint rather than empowerment. "When everything starts to look like a Pinterest board, it's hard to feel like you're actually designing something," said a visual narrative student from Seoul Institute of the Arts. These students often invest more time in analog experimentation or unstructured sketching, even if it complicates their digital production phase.

Experience level also matters. First- and second-year students are more reliant on templates and tend to view them as instructional aids. More advanced students, particularly those exposed to research-based or concept-driven studios, begin to critically interrogate the systems they use. Several capstone students interviewed at Dongduk Women's University described intentionally "breaking" or "hacking" templates as part of their thesis strategies—challenging what they saw as algorithmic conformity.

Finally, students' design values—whether shaped by personal identity, cultural influences, or exposure to independent creative communities—play a crucial role. Those who prioritize expression, narrative, or ambiguity often resist pre-structured outputs, while those who seek commercial clarity or brand legibility embrace them. This divide points not only to aesthetic preference but to deeper epistemological tensions: What is design for? Who is it for? And how much of it should be decided by machines?

8. Rethinking Visual Literacy for the Computational Era

In an educational environment increasingly shaped by design automation, algorithmic presets, and interface-first aesthetics, the concept of visual literacy must be redefined. Traditional design curricula have long focused on formal principles—balance, contrast, hierarchy, composition—but these are no longer sufficient to equip students for the layered complexities of computational visual culture. The challenge now is to cultivate a form of literacy that is not only visual but also procedural, critical, and system-aware.

Visual communication education in the computational era must teach students to read and write *with* and *against* the machine. This involves more than software proficiency; it requires an ability to interrogate the assumptions encoded in design tools, to recognize when a "default" is actually an ideological position, and to see visual decisions as the product of both human and algorithmic authorship.

Educators must therefore develop pedagogical models that bridge system fluency with conceptual reflexivity. This might include teaching the history of design systems alongside their digital implementation, analyzing how template libraries reflect cultural or commercial bias, or even exposing the mechanics of AI-based layout engines through design "unpacking" exercises. Students should be asked not only to use a template but to question why it looks the way it does—and what it might exclude.

Moreover, the future of visual literacy must embrace pluralism. If algorithmic systems tend to normalize aesthetics—flattening visual difference into globally digestible sameness—then curriculum must actively resist that pull. This means valuing ambiguity over clarity, hybridity over consistency, and disruption over optimization. Encouraging students to bring in vernacular forms, cultural traditions, or speculative visual languages will help decenter the visual grammar imposed by

dominant design software.

Ultimately, rethinking visual literacy for the computational era is not about rejecting templates or automation—it's about situating them critically. As students learn to operate within structured digital environments, they must also learn to push against those structures, to see space where the system leaves none, and to remember that design, at its core, is not simply what looks good or functions well, but what asks a new question of the world.

References

Çiğdem, Z., & Ürey, U. (2021). Fostering creative cognition in design education: A comparative analysis of algorithmic and heuristic educational methods in basic design education. *METU Journal of the Faculty of Architecture*, *38*(1), 163–183. https://open.metu.edu.tr/handle/11511/92088

Fleischmann, K. (2024). The commodification of creativity: Integrating generative artificial intelligence in higher education design curriculum. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2024.2427039

MacNeil, S., Huang, Z., Chen, K., Ding, Z., & Yu, A. (2023). Freeform templates: Combining freeform curation with structured templates. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1–13). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3591196.3593337

Omran Zailuddin, M. F. N., & Nik Harun, N. A. (2024). Redefining creative education: A case study analysis of AI in design courses. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, ahead-of-print. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JRIT-01-2024-0019/full/html

Vázquez, E. (2024). Teaching parametric design: Fostering algorithmic thinking through incomplete recipes. *Open House International*, *49*(1), 140–152. https://doi.org/10.1108/OHI-06-2023-0135