

The Qualitative Analysis on Contemporary Approaches toward Architectural Training in Iran

¹Reza Naghdbishi, ^{2*}Shahindokht Barghjelveh, ³Seyed Gholamreza Islami, ⁴Hamed Kamelnia

¹ PhD, Department of Art and Architecture, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

² Associate Professor, Department of Planning and Design of the Environment, Environmental Sciences Research Institute, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

³ Associate Professor, School of Architecture, University College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.

⁴ Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture and Urban Engineering, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.

Received 04.25.2015; Accepted 06.15.2015

ABSTRACT: The present article is intended to analyze the status of architectural education during two periods before and after Cultural Revolution in Iran and in order to interpret approaches and paradigms, methods, and way of its development thereby, it deals with criticism of current situation in the field of architectural education. For this purpose, it has been tried to separate different fields of quantitative and qualitative development of the discussed subject with historical review on formation of architectural academic schools during recent period. The methodology of current research is based on using the relevant information about structure of architectural education in Iran during two major periods, which have been subjected to data-mining by taking an interpretative-historical approach. In addition, the present condition has been criticized with review on the existing theories in this field and afterwards in order to achieve the given result and for conclusion of the contemporary attitudes in Iranian architectural education. Findings have been analyzed according to strategic analysis to disambiguate the process of planning for the future based on internal strong and weak point as well as external opportunities and threats (SWOT) in educational structure of architecture and eventually following to evaluation of today status and position becomes available for access in the future.

Keywords: Architectural Education, Cultural Revolution, Criticism, Iran, current Situation.

INTRODUCTION

Before involvement in the subject of architecture to its own concept, architectural education depends on concept of education, which its theme has been accompanied with regulation and several changes in presentation of content in Iran as well and the scientific, which encompassed this subject, also followed the certain taste or paradigm since the past time. Consequently, architectural education, which is assumed as a complex facet of educational continuum, is not exception to this rule as a result “the education was also developed with transformation of Western Communities after Industrial Revolution as well. Also in Iran, although social developments did not occur institutionally and exogenously and they took mainly place in imported form and as a result of relationships with certain goals; nonetheless, they led to change in many

affairs including education.” (Taghi, 1995) and these imported systems of architectural education in Iran included education by means of techniques in different schools such as Beaux Arts, Bauhaus and Italy, (Etesam, 2010a; Etesam, 2010b) and thereafter the traces of American schools (Frank, 2004) might be also visible in their body with change in educational configuration.

Occurrence of Islamic Revolution, which was followed by Cultural Revolution, also accompanied with motive for internal transformation and “justice-centered and decentralized perspective” (Soleimani, 2013) and after passing more than three decades from this development, although today the architectural education system has many important achievements, due to lack of occurrence of fundamental transformation it has been limited to static status. While, after presentation of identical program during period of Cultural

*Corresponding Author Email: s-barghjelveh@sbu.ac.ir

Revolution and after many years, many noticeable changes and advancements have occurred in different related civilization and cultural at regional and global scale where each of them could be capable to affect especially for development, fluency, and advancement in architecture schools; however, they have not been adequately noticed. Other factor that can be assayed in this regard is related to subject of quantitative growth and accelerating expansion of architecture schools in both sponsor public and private organizations for education. They originated from internal and external changes in paradigmatic structures within several social layers in which the subject of attachment to passing professional educational degrees are assumed of these types. Since “the higher education has exceed from the level of case selected interests and the special group and/ or even middle class, it has been turned into pervasive and public and accumulated topic. The mass of applicants for higher education not attracted universities and higher educational institutes only to acquire appropriate occupational opportunities after passing higher educational degrees but they express their desire to knowledge such as citizens of information world via their right as well as being informed and acquisition of awareness. Similarly, with searching for opportunity to learning at higher level, they in fact look for defining a role for their own in learning community and thereby they search for realization of essence and self-actualization in terms of motivational aspect.” (Ferasatkah, 2009). In addition to this social request, the globalization, digital technology, and market-driven educational economy are deemed as strong forces for change in academic environments. (Allen & Cavanagh, 2004, Ockman, 2012, 10) In which any force plays remarkable role in developing of demands.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this research, the methodology is based on utilization from the related information to structure of architectural education in Iran during two major time periods, which have been studied by data-mining with interpretative- historical approach and current situation has been criticized with review on the existing theories in this field. Thereafter the findings have been analyzed according to strategic analysis for disambiguation of planning process in the future for the sake of acquisition to the given result and conclusion of contemporary attitudes in architectural education in Iran based on internal strong and weak points and external opportunities and threats (SWOT) in the structure of architectural education. Finally, it is tended to evaluate today position and status of this trend.¹

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The history of architectural education in Iran is characterized as one of developing countries² may be divided generally and with definition of definite boundary into two parts i.e. before and after Islamic Revolution (1979). The reason for this classification is related to difference in techniques of formation of education process in any period and event of Cultural

Revolution. The development before Cultural Revolution, which approximately included four decades, cover the period of establishment of the first architectural school, period of establishment of École des Beaux Arts educational system, period of developments during 1960s, the career of opening the new schools and period of change in educational system from French to American educational system. The developments after Cultural Revolution, which began with occurrence of Islamic Revolution; passing so far more than three decades; include different periods. Period of closing down universities and reopening them along with changes in textbook contents, relative changes in educational system, the quantitative development career, opening of quasi-public schools³, period of tendency-centrism, establishment of advanced educational courses, period of change of courses in architectural education and eventually cover static period. These changes and careers have moved toward present time while different developments have occurred in all of cultural and civilization fields, which have often directly or indirectly affected on them so in the following it has been explained about these cases in details.

Review on Developments and Events before Islamic Revolution

The history of architectural academic education in Iran is dated back from the early decades of twentieth century. Architectural education in process of renovation of educational method acquired the meaningful identity in Iran along with establishment of non- traditional schools including Dar ul-Funun School. Previously, the educational method was accompanied to a combination of profession with to date architectural knowledge with an approach that was called as traditional (Ghoddusifar et al., 2012, Kheirollahi, 2012). The architectural student was an apprentice, who acquired senses of sight and hearing, touching, and research internal insight over the time to become a professional architect. The form and method of education were changed with opening of schools such as Dar ul-Funun. Afterwards, by changes in political and social features and administrative structure; accompanied to development during first Pahlavi's period; the administrative powers were divided in Iran (Etesam, 2010a). And by emergence of attitudes inspired from western paradigms, training of arts and architecture were converted into art atelier (affected by Iranian and German professional schools) with academic merging in 1934 and then they were turned into Fine Arts college in 1940 (Rezaei et al., 2013).

With establishment of Tehran University in 1934 and then gradual formation of faculty of Fine Arts in 1940, the architectural education might experience a new form from its traditional shape toward academic method. Inter alia, along with the created governmental developments in the fields of modernism and moving of Iran toward 'Modern Iran' (Bani Masoud, 2009), the backgrounds of forming a modernist movement is noticeable in educational contents with desires toward western world.

On October 1938, Ministry of Profession and Art sent the suggested statutes for several educational institutions called 'Higher technical schools of ancient Fine Arts', 'Modern Fine Arts', and 'Women's public technical school' for revision to Sciences Supreme Council. This council put these bills on its own agenda for review and study on them on July 1939 and after a few months at last the institutional charter and plan titled 'Higher technical school of Fine Arts' were approved on December 1939 (Soltanzadeh, 2008). It was established with three branches of architecture, portraiture, and sculpture on the site of Marvi High School (Mahboubi Ardakani, 1971) and after about one year, the site of this faculty was transferred to basement of technical faculty (Kobari, 2008). The accurate consideration and assay and pondering in the first and primary curricula of this faculty indicates clearly that the faculties of Fine Arts were constructed with exploitation and based on heritage of art schools during Qajar Era, especially the heritage of Constitutional Period. The most salient sample of these infrastructures included the school of fine industries (1910) was inaugurated by Mohammad Ghaffari (known as Kamal-ol- Molk), school of music, Music higher School (music technical school), and higher technical schools of Fine Arts (Zargarinezhad, 2007).

Developments of 1960s and Establishment of New Schools

The process of excerption from teaching method of *École des Beaux Arts* remained approximately unchanged by the end of 1960s in terms of educational technique and structure. Along with developments and protests during 1960s in Europe, several changes and developments also entered in universities. During the given decade when architectural education was subjected to monotonous and "static trend" (Etesam, 2010a), so with respect to change in to- date conditions such as technologies, theories etc., several changes were also exerted in universities. Similarly, the requirement for building restoration, urbanism, special technologies, and special issues etc. caused new disciplines to be created as well. Simultaneously there was government's tendency in Iran to change educational system from French to American style and these changes were owed to this issue to some extent. During this period, National University (today Shahid Beheshti University) was inaugurated with two faculties of economics and architecture. With respect to the existing problem in *Beaux Arts* System, it caused creating desire to try another system e.g. Italy. Most of the instructors in this faculty were graduated from Italy and theoretical lessons such as mathematics were taught in this faculty. Likewise, Along with two University of Tehran and National University, Iran Faculty of Science and Industry was active in the field of architecture.

After Islamic Revolution

The developments after Islamic Revolution included general change in academic curriculum. With respect to social

conditions, this change was exerted mainly quantitatively with respect to social conditions after a short period of time and also special developments arose following to this essential change. Pursuant to Islamic Revolution (1979), project of Cultural Revolution started so it was stipulated to exert fundamental changes in all of cultural and educational fields. Universities were closed down for three years and some of researchers and politicians started creating mechanisms to remove western aspect educational system thereby to take Islamic cultural approaches in universities of Iran. After three years, uniform plans were innovated and the architecture educational centers were reopened in 1984. Several faculties of architecture could not change curricula and a certain group of criteria was employed for educational evaluation. While the educational main structure was conserved, the new syllabi were added where they included some periods of Islamic art, Islamic architecture, rural design and development, and other courses to remove problems of the former educational curricula (Saedsamiea, 2008). Of course, according to viewpoint from Etesam (2010a), there was a type of "emotional approach" for change and formulation of curricula in this period as well. Likewise, according to (Nouhi, 2003), codification of the unified curricula was put on the agenda for all of architectural faculties during the period of revolution and later other faculties were established according to the same unified curricula. The features of Fine Arts Atelier system were never used in this unified curriculum. The educational basis was transformed into a partial Atelier with the curriculum model of National University (Shahid Beheshti University). Although, some changes were exerted in syllabus and contents of the courses, the educational model was not essentially changed. The major changes in educational curriculum during two pre- and post- Islamic revolutionary periods are visible in Table (1)⁴. Similarly, several conferences have been held to promote subject of architectural education after Islamic Revolution⁵.

Criticism of Iranian Architectural Education Status Quo

Based on what it already mentioned about history of teaching architecture in Iran, four different fields of critique may be identified: Critique of the phase of admission to enter into architecture school; Criticism of approaches and paradigms; Critique of educational methods; and Criticism of quantitative development and lack of qualitative development.

Critique of the Phase of Admission to Enter into Architecture School

What it inferred from review on status quo indicates that some of the given defects in organization architectural education stem from education before university. Accordingly, in an investigation done by Hodjat and Ansari (2010) on beginner students of architectural discipline, they have evaluated and described four types of damages derived from difference among high school and university periods. These damages

Table 1: Major changes and developments in architectural education of Iran)

Occurrence	Changes and developments	Period
Before Cultural Revolution	Establishment of Fine Arts faculty and education by means of Beaux Arts method	From the end of Qajar Era to the middle of period of Pahlavi II
	Change in educational method from atelier system to yearly- based system and opening other architectural schools (Iran University of Science and Technology and National University (Shahid Beheshti)	The middle period of Pahlavi II up to Islamic Revolution 1979
After Cultural Revolution	Reopening of universities and essential change in curricula of architecture discipline	Since Islamic Revolution 1979
	Establishing professional doctorate of architecture (PhD) to provide members of faculty for universities	
	To change MA continuous course into Bachelor's Course and creation of various majors MA in intermittent course	

include 1) Despair and disappointment toward continuance of education and sometimes depression; 2) Desire to anarchy and deconstruction; 3) Sense of competition with each other and removal of others and frustration from their progress; and 4) Concern for evaluation. Nonetheless, with respect to special characteristics of architectural discipline, the educational strategies had been proposed for each of these damages as well. Therefore, this might lead to a type of rethinking and revision in architectural education that if architecture schools could deal with removal of these defects at the beginning point of entrance of students an important step might be taken to start education. Likewise, the other problem that may encounter in architecture schools is to admit students with irrelevant art backgrounds (Dorudgar, 2009), while no effort is made to evaluate this qualification at the beginning of entrance exam. So, the architecture schools are exposed to the mass of students throughout the country at large scale where they lack the adequate knowledge and appropriate level of capability in this discipline. Although, in contrast Mahmoodi (2012) argues that non-compliance of the educational disciplines of student before and after admission in university may be compensated with high talent in students (in University of Tehran), this issue may not be demonstrated for a large range of other architecture schools throughout the country while art-based approaches toward education of architecture are undeniable. Moreover, according to opinion of Taghizadeh (2012), such non-heterogeneity in various talents creates further damage in process of education.

Criticism of Approaches and Paradigms

Over the time, architectural training has witnessed different paradigmatic developments, which were consequently affected by these changes following to its multiple aspects. As the

first event the modern attitude, sociopolitical developments in 1960s, Islamic Revolution, post-war policies (Iran and Iraq), emergence of postmodern doctrines and the aftermath philosophical and intellectual developments are assumed of these types of changes.

Hodjat (2002) supposes two traditional and modern campuses for architectural education in Iran where according to his opinion, separation and lack of link between these two trends have damaged architectural education with respect to cultural-historic background of it in Iran at pas time. Similarly, with occurrence of Cultural Revolution, several changes were exerted in type of paradigmatic approaches toward architecture. From viewpoint of Saedsamiea (2008), all of artistic educational attitudes were ignored in Cultural Revolution. It assumed the method of architectural education or other art related disciplines similar to teaching of scientific discipline. Therefore, rather than making curriculum as uniform in all of art faculties, it presented that curriculum similar to scientific disciplines while some experts (Adibi, 2012; Motalebi, 2012) maintain that no identical conditions may be considered for all of faculties of architecture. Likewise, according to viewpoint of Hodjat (2002) "the current paradigmatic approaches in Iran do not posit something of type of time and they are wandering about Zenophilia, retrospective tendency, and nihilism." So, despite of viewpoints from some experts (Adibi, 2012; Haghir, 2012), teaching of architecture still takes traditional attitude prospectively and it is not situated within the boundaries of today knowledge.

Critique of Educational Methods

The methods have been also changed through passing different intellectual various steps under the influence of such approaches. The educational structure has been always typically involved

in the given time developments under the influence of the paradigm imports in architectural training in Iran and sometimes it has been affected with internalization and transformation of attitudes and has been often exposed to several trials and errors as well. Accordingly, Akrami (2003) argues, “the problems of teaching architecture stemmed from lack of an original attitude, particularly in architecture schools have caused the education not to be integrated and to lack certain orientation. Different and often paradoxical and sometimes superficial and personal attitudes without intellectual supports and mainly excerpted from western schools, have caused mental and intellectual frustration in students. And most of them may be graduated from architecture schools without impression and acquisition of proper paradigm and even correct perception from a good architect and eventually the most talented of them become the imitators for well-known western architecture.” Alternately, Einifar (2008) classifies the teaching methods in architecture schools of Iran before Cultural Revolution into three types of design- centered (University of Tehran), Execution- oriented (Iran University of Science and Technology IUST), and environment- centered (National University- Shahid Beheshti University).

Regarding trend of methods in architectural education in Iran, Hodjat (2002) believes that the architecture traditional education, Beaux Arts - based education, and Bauhaus educational method are placed at one side while teaching of architecture during three recent decades are placed in another side. In this attitude, definite nature and determination is assumed as the fixed feature for the first camp while uncertainty and indetermination will be supposed as the obvious characteristic of the second camp. On the other hand, he also posits two convergent and divergent teaching methods. The convergent education covers it in three forms including traditional education, tradition- oriented education, and ideological education. Accordingly, he implies that:

‘Traditional education in its own type and only at its time- was the best method of teaching architecture and at present its achievement may be also praised and admired as well. Passing this world from traditional period and entering into new age, confrontation to new requirements and facilities, and new observations and communications as well as new impression and assumption about today architecture may be no longer repeated and exerted ... Tradition- oriented teaching, whether in technique or as example, denotes attachment to past utilities and overlooking of today realities. Product of such education is hybrid constructions, which try to indicate today practice with old framework ... in Some of Iranian architecture schools, the ideological teaching as well as attachment to a movement, which its origin has been outdated is deemed as an issue that requires revision and review in fundamentals of architectural education in today Iran (2002, 53-54).’

In contrast, he divides divergent education into forms of tendency-free education and over- tendency education:

‘In tendency- free education, the teacher avoids from dealing

with value- driven subjects and/ or describes numerous philosophies and paradigms of architecture with taking objective role and assigns the process of finding and building of character of the pupil to him/ her. In over- tendency teaching method, the teacher changes his/ her method in favor, as defending and developer for the latest intellectual doctrines and architectural styles in the western world and also changes direction and orientation of education and replaces a taste with another one (2002, 5).’

The previous changes occurred in methods from vertical ateliers to horizontal ateliers have caused a type of dichotomy in this method. “Some of schools are still attached to atelier technique, while some others have been tended to new methods. So it can be concluded that the faculties of architecture are wandering about, in the absence of theory and professional architects are involved and confused because they are invaded by absurd and often senseless recent theorizations in the west and they may not be led to right path” (Gorji Mahlabani, 2010). Similarly, Karimi Moshaver (2009) argues in this regard, “the problem of Atelier educational method in Iran is in that the position of design knowledge is not certain in teaching process and decision making processes do not progress usually based on personal comments of the teacher of lesson and this may not be adequate for proper design. For this reason, it is required paying attention primarily to creation of design knowledge in Atelier teaching.”

Although some experts believe in usefulness of separating continuous master’s course from continuous BA and intermittent master’s course (Einifar, 2012; Mahmoodi, 2012), in contrast some other ones argue that this technique may hit the blow to architectural education by means of such a change (Heydari, 2012; Motalebi, 2012). This is the consequence of lack of uniformity in method and procedure for teaching and it indicates that the architectural teachers are wandering in the field of science and art (Heydari, 2012).

In an investigation that was carried out by Islami and Islami (2012) from the viewpoint of students in faculty of architecture in University of Tehran, they concluded that about 57.7% of students in this course believed in requisite for modification of the status quo in architectural teaching system. Regarding content of curriculum of architecture discipline in a study, Zarghami et al. (2007) have proposed that revision in architecture syllabi might seem as necessary. Likewise, they argued that there was no balance between the anticipated credits for various potentials and the capabilities needed for the community.

Criticism of Quantitative Development and Lack of Qualitative Development

With increase of population after Islamic Revolution during 1980s and 1990s and outbreak of Imposed War (1980-1988) that was led to rising governmental costs, increase in number of educational institutes became inevitable by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). Although increase in

Table 2: Analysis on approaches and method of teaching contemporary architecture of Iran

Occurrence	Period	Strength	Weakness	Threat	Opportunity
Before Islamic Revolution	Period of opening of the first architecture school;	Merging of art schools/ entering in academic field in education/ development in method	Leaving away traditional educational techniques	Separation from history of Iranian architecture in subject of education	Readiness for development
	Period of establishment of Beaux Arts educational system	Assuming the method/ the existing order/ diligence in teaching and learning affairs	Project- centrist and overlooking of culture	Ignoring of human-theoretical issues	Assay of design process up to building and organizing individual persons and legal entities in architecture profession
	Period of developments in 1960s	Tools of social requirements for change	Quick changes/ overlooking of advantages of atelier system	Imitation in social-cultural issues in design approaches from the west	Paying attention to other sciences and employing them in project
	Period of inauguration of new schools	Change in method and approach/ polyphony	Lack of coordination of schools	Lack of synergy in employing methods and experiences	Entering of new paradigms
	Period of changing of French educational system into American educational system	New approach toward education	Downplaying practical design in atelier	Imitation again from the west	Application of new educational methods
After Islamic Revolution	Period of closing down universities	Paying attention to local aspects of architecture	Emotional approach toward educational curricula and system	Distance and gap between former and new systems in practical education	Pondering in the past time and thinking to present new educational system
	Period of development in contents of textbooks and relative change in architecture educational system	Considering Islamic architectural issues and subject of village in content of curriculum	Overlooking of past experiences and guidelines in teaching of architecture	Considering various art disciplines as similar to other courses	New development in educational system and opportunity for change or modification and justice in education
	Period of quantitative development and opening of quasi-public schools	Approach of privatization in universities and moving toward geographical justice in education	Shortage of specialist and experienced instructor along with special facilities for architecture	Degree- centrist	Decentralization of education
	Establishment of advanced education courses	Reliance on domestic educational system instead of sending student abroad	Non- compliance of development in educational system with professional system	Lack of quality in applied research	Focusing on architectural research and growth in theory and knowledge
	Period of tendency- centrist and changing course (degree) in architectural education	Paying attention to expertise to promote architecture knowledge	Lack of definition specialty in professional community (Engineering Council System etc.)	Shorter time for learning of architecture art that contradicts to existential essence of it	Creation of interdisciplinary approaches and methods and development of original architecture
Period of developing advance education courses and static trend in theory	Opening of path for research and theory in teaching of architecture	Lack of change in contents of architecture educational courses passing through three decades	Lack of certain approach in teaching/ graduation of less-knowledgeable students	Formulation and regional organizing of educational approaches and theories	

quantity of these institutes was proposed as requirement for the given time and it might cover the social requirement to acquire higher education, it only covered the quantitative development. In addition, in the absence of educational facilities and specialist instructor, it formed partial courses of general specialty in architecture where they lacked the needed quality. At least in early years of their activity- and several dispersed and “repeated experiences were exercised along with reconstruction of curricula from past decades in the absence of a formulated and approved method for teaching of basic lessons in these schools.”⁶ (Hodjat, 2003). Based on such a structure in a statistical research, Alai (2010) refers to rate of growth in number of admitted students in the field of architectural engineering and describes “unconventional status” for such quantitative growth. He mentions the problems in “educational dimensions and continuous study and more importantly employment of graduates in this course” and assumes the solution for this problem as “dependent on rapid and effective measure.” Such quantitative development affected even on public universities, which are claimed for quality to meet their financial requirements, in the next years⁷. The survey of Islami and Islami (2010) confirms the aforesaid issue in which the students acknowledged to lack of proportion between numbers of admitted students in their discipline with the existing facilities of the given faculty in administration of questionnaire for pathology in faculty of architecture in University of Tehran. In contrast to such quantitative development, it can be expressed that today “one of the methods in universities throughout the world and exposure to mass group of applicants, who have moved toward it, is the conceptual diversity and flexibility versus the former concept of ‘all or none’. It is movement, has caused creating the spectrum of various curricula and courses, at different formal and informal levels for various strata and groups in the developed communities” (Ferasatkah, 2009). Likewise, quantitative development is not always supposed as a weakness provided, it is coordinated with quality of education and even diversification of universities will create the conditions for competition among them and any school may achieve success in certain field and their graduates will achieve special position in wide field of professional business along several other attitudes regarding design teaching.

CONCLUSION

Identifying the past and present statuses to awareness for future development is assumed as one of the feedback cornerstones in any educational system. The academic architecture educational system in Iran has been subjected to changes and developments during eleven periods as follows: Period of opening of the first architecture school; Period of establishment of Beaux Arts educational system; Period of developments in 1960s; Period of inauguration of new schools; Period of changing of French educational system into

American educational system;
 Period of closing down universities;
 Period of development in contents of textbooks and relative change in architecture educational system;
 Period of quantitative development and opening of quasi-public schools;
 Establishment of advanced education courses;
 Period of tendency- centrism and changing course (degree) in architectural education; and
 Period of developing advance education courses and static trend in theory.

Today, these changes are exposed to some conditions, which are static and they are tended to only quantitative developments while quality has not been dealt with in them so they are required for study and research in order to remove disadvantages and to develop their advantages. In Table (2), the strong and weak points as well as the existing threats and opportunities have been studied with data mining in Iranian contemporary architectural education system according to eleven aforementioned periods.

AKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper is based on the authors Ph.D thesis in the Science and Research Branch of Islamic Azad University , Tehran, Iran, which was supervised by Dr. Shahindokht Barghjelveh and advised by Dr. Seyed Gholamreza Islami and Dr. Hamed Kamelnia.

ENDNOTES

1. Whereas review on strategies is not placed within the scope of this article thus this issue is pursued by the authors regarding another research.
2. Simultaneously with developing and spreading modern philosophy in Europe and its dissemination through other countries, which are hereafter called as developing countries, the imported systems have the highest effect in changing the given fields in all of structural scenes at undeveloped countries within different military, administrative, educational, economic frameworks etc. in terms of industrial aspect. The education, which has formed traditionally in most of these nations, is changed under the influence of entering into Modern age and causes academic methods to change direction where such a change is assumed as acceptance of time developments as well in the other hand. With respect to the approach that is called as modern in this change and development and it has international reputation as well, the target countries include third world countries and especially in Middle East so that Egypt, Turkey, Iran, Bangladesh, and Morocco have laid their educational foundations on the basis of Beaux Art or Bauhaus educational system (Salama, 1995, 55). From Diba point of view (1986, 188), training of architecture that had been imported in Iran with foreign paradigm did not compliant with economic and cultural requirements of Iran. In his opinion, both physical and

social- economic fields of environment were analyzed in new curriculum of teaching architecture (Cultural Revolution) and traditional and contemporary culture was defined.

3. According to comment of authors, architecture schools are beyond public sponsorship and they are interpreted as quasi-public schools because of employing identical educational system and lack independence in content planning in architecture schools

4. In an investigation that was conducted by Islami and Naghdbishi (2011) on teaching method used by several teachers, after Islamic Revolution, the teaching methods in national architecture schools suggested the point that several theories, methods, and techniques have formed according to the theoretical frameworks in architectural education in Iran and they have led to different approaches in teaching method in which several similarities and difference may be seen in their objectives, strategies, methods, and content-base results. These approaches have been analyzed in this study based on five subjects including theoretical framework, educational goal, teaching method, educational strategies, and results.

5. Following to search for creating quality for architectural education, Fine Arts Campus in University of Tehran was tended to hold conferences about teaching of architecture during years after Islamic Revolution. Although this subject is followed with diligence perfectly, developing of architecture discipline in various courses and majors and even in the smallest cities in this country has also caused the effectiveness and power of this series of meetings are not sufficient in these fields. These conferences have been held in five careers by the aid of Dr. Amir Saeed Mahmoodi. The most salient outcome from these conferences is to confess to the existing serious problems so rather than their importance, resolving them is not easily possible as well and needs to cooperate with educational policymaking organizations for development in architectural curriculum. In addition, several researches have been carried out in abroad by the current architectural professors of Iran's universities (Nadimi, 1996; Alai, 1998; Islami, 1998; Mahmoodi, 2001; Hodjat, 2001; Izadi, 2002 ;). And researchers in doctoral courses of professional architecture (Azizi, 2007; Torabi, 2008; Andjomshooa, 2011; Naghdbishi, 2014) and under sponsorship of aforesaid teachers so they signify the effort made for improving quality of education and this originated from advanced education specialized courses, which did not already exist in architectural education courses.

6. Architecture schools have been rapidly developed after Cultural Revolution.

7. These changes include quantitative developments during years 2005-2010 such as opening of non- profit universities, International Campuses, admission by university at second turn (non free admission) and governmental all- inclusive supports from Payam-E-Noor (non- attendance) Universities versus developing Islamic Azad University.

REFERENCES

- Adibi, D. (2012). *Interview: Pathology of faculty of architecture*, Tehran: College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.
- Alai, A. (1998). *Knowledge Requirements in Architecture: A Study of Attitudes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Manchester, School of Architecture. UK.
- Alaie, A. (2010). Increasing the Number of Accepted Students in Architectural Engineering Field and Its Implications. *Soffe*, (20), 51. 41-48.
- Allen, E., & Cavanagh, T. (2004). Architecture, Technology and Education. *Journal of Architectural Education*. (58), 1, 3-4.
- Andjomshooa, A. (2011) *Tacit Knowledge in Design Education*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch. Department of Architecture. Iran.
- Azizi, Sh. (2007). *Designing of Architectural Training Model in Iran*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch. Department of Architecture. Iran.
- Azizi, Sh. (2010). Necessity of the flexible System in Architectural Training for Sustainable Accountability at Global and Domestic Challenges, *Hoviatshahr*, (5), 7, 43-52.
- Bani Masoud, A. (2009). *Iranian Contemporary Architecture*. Tehran: Honar Memari Gharn.
- Diba, D. (1986). *Training Architects: Iran*. In A. Evin (Ed.) *Architectural Education in the Islamic World*. Singapore: Concept Media/Aga Khan Award for Architecture,
- Dorudgar, Gh. (2009). Modification of Selecting Students for Preferment Quality of Architectural Education. *Honarha-ye-ziba*, 38, 25-37.
- Einifar, A. (2008). The Developments of Architectural Education in Iran. *Memari va Farhang*, 10, 34, 93-97.
- Einifar, A. (2012). *Interview: Pathology of Faculty of Architecture*. Tehran: College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.
- Etesam, I. (2010 a). *The Lecture of Styles and Theories of Architectural Training*, Architectural Course (Ph.D), Department of Art and Architecture. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran.
- Etesam, I. (2010 b). *The Lecture of Iranian Contemporary Architecture*, Architectural Course (Ph.D), Department of Art and Architecture. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran.
- Ferasatkah, M. (2009). *Iranian University and the Quality*, Tehran: Agah Publication.
- Frank, M. (2004). Pure Design and American Architectural Education. *Journal of Architectural Education*, (57), 4, 28-40.
- Ghoddusifar, S. H., Etesam, I., Habib, F., & Panahi Barjay, H. (2012). Iranian Traditional Architecture Education and Place of Whole Brain Education, *Journal of Iranian Architecture Studies*, (1) 1, 39-58.
- Gorji Mahlabani, Y. (2010). Architectural Education of

Today and future Challenge, *Educational Technology*, (4) 3, 223-234.

Haghir, S. (2012). *Interview: Pathology of Faculty of Architecture*. Tehran: College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.

Heydari, Sh. (2012). *Interview: Pathology of Faculty of Architecture*, Tehran: College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.

Hodjat, I. (2002). New Trends to Architectural Education Methods in Iran, *Honarha-ye-ziba*, (12), 50-69.

Hodjat, I. (2003). Creative Education, Experiment of 2002. In A. S. Mahmoodi (Ed.), *Architectural Education. Proceedings of the 2th Conference of Architectural Education*, (pp. 45-54). Tehran: university of Tehran Press & Negah-e-Emrouz.

Hodjat, I., & Ansari, H.R. (2010). Rethinking in Educational Behavior in Architecture, *Honarha-ye-ziba*, (44), 15-25.

Hodjat, I. (2001). *Tradition and Innovation in Architectural Education*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Tehran, Department of Architecture. Iran.

Islami S. Gh., & Islami, S. Y. (2012). *Modeling practical Tactics of the School of Architecture Based on Existing Pathology and Being Organized*, faculty of Fine Arts, university of Tehran, Tehran, Iran., Research Project, Faculty of Fine Art, University of Tehran, Tehran.

Islami S. Gh., & Naghdbishi, R. (2011). Modeling the Department of Architecture's Structural Strategies Derived from the Past Experiences at the University College of Fine Arts of Tehran. *Armanshahr*. (5), 9, 1-17.

Islami, S. Gh. (1998). *Endogenous Development: A Model for the Process of Man-Environment Transaction*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Faculty of Environmental Studies, Herriot-Watt University, Edinburgh.

Izadi, A. (2002). *Student Selection Criteria for the Study of Architecture with Reference to Iran*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Sheffield. Department of Architecture. UK.

Karimi, M. (2009). *The Place of Students in Architectural Education Design Process*, In A. S. Mahmoodi (Ed.), *Architectural Education. Proceedings of the 2th Conference of Architectural Education*, (pp. 80-91) Tehran: university of Tehran Press & Negah-e-Emrouz.

Karimi, GH. (2003). Comparative Study of procedural Model of architectural education (J. Lang A roach) and Traditional Architecture Education in Iran. In A. S. Mahmoodi (Ed.), *Architectural Education. Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of Architectural Education*. Tehran: University of Tehran Press and Negah-e-Emrouz.

Kheirollahi, M. (2012). The Place and Influence of Intuition in the Creativity of the Architecture Design Process, *International Journal of Architecture and Urban Development*. (1), 3, 57-62.

Kobari, Gh. (2008), Review of the Past, *Memari va Farhang*, 32, 26-35.

Mahboubi Ardakani, H. (1971). *History of Transformation in Tehran University and Tehran's Institute of Higher Education*, Tehran: University of Tehran Press.

Mahmoodi, A. (2001). *The Design Process in Architecture (A Pedagogic Approach Using Interactive Thinking)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. UK: University of Leeds.

Mahmoodi, A. (2012). *Interview: Pathology of Faculty of Architecture*, Tehran: College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.

Motalebi, Gh. (2012). *Interview: Pathology of Faculty of Architecture*, Tehran: College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.

Nadimi, H. (1996). *Conceptualizing a Framework for Integrity in Architectural Education with Some Reference to Iran*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of York. UK.

Naghdbishi, R. (2014). *Architectural Training with focus on Design Process from Viewpoint of Behavioral Science*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch. Department of Architecture, Tehran, Iran.

Nouhi, H. (2003). A Review of the Method of Architectural Education in Iran for Atelier System Approach, In A. S. Mahmoodi (Ed.), *Architectural Education. Proceedings of the 2th Conference of Architectural Education*, (pp. 68-80). Tehran: university of Tehran Press & Negah-e-Emrouz.

Ockman J. (2012). *Architecture School: Three Centuries of Educating of Architects in North America*. Association of Collegiate School of Architecture. MIT Press. Cambridge. Massachusetts.

Rezaie, H., Etessam, I., & Mokhtabad Amre'ei, S.M. (2013). The Influence of Paris School of Fine Arts on Architecture Education in Iran. *International Journal of Architecture and Urban Development*. (3), 4, 55-64.

Saedsamiea, A. (2008). The Education System, *Memari va Farhang*, (32), 30, 12-21.

Salama, A. (1995). *New Trends in Architectural Education, Designing the Design Studio*. Tailored Text & Unlimited Potential Publishing

Soleimani, M.R. (2013). *A Review in Concept of Identity in Iranian Contemporary Architecture (A Case Study: 1979-2013)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch. Department of Architecture. Iran.

Soltanzadeh, H. (2008). Formation of the College of Fine Arts, *Memari va Farhang*, 32, 5-12.

Taghi, Z. (1995). Architectural Training in Contemporary Area. *Soffe*, (5), 30, 54-61.

Taghizadeh, K. (2012). *Interview: Pathology of Faculty of Architecture*, Tehran: College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran.

Torabi, Z. (2008). *Placing of Design Process in Creative Education*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Islamic Azad

University, Science and Research Branch. Department of Architecture. Iran.

Zargarinezhad, GH. (2007). From School of Beaux Industries to College of Fine Arts, Review on Background of Formation

of Fine Arts in Tehran University, *Honarha-ye-ziba*, (30), 5.

Zarghami, I., Hoseyni, S. B., Sajadi Gh., & Parvin S. (2007). Analysis of Education in Architectural Engineering, *Education Technology*, (2) 2, 135-150.