Civil Engineering Research Journal
ISSN: 2575-8950

Juniper Publishers
key to the Researchers

Mini Review
Volume 12 Issue 3 - November 2021
DOI: 10.19080/CERJ.2021.12.555839

Civil Eng Res J

A Value-Based Approach to the Programming of Training Centers

Mohammadhossein Shahani*

School of Art and Architecture, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

Submission: November 08, 2021; **Published:** November 16, 2021

***Corresponding author:** Mohammadhossein Shahani, School of Art and Architecture, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

Abstract

This paper explores a value-based approach to the programming of training centers. For this purpose, it firstly argues the necessity of considering value sets in the programming. In this case, the advancement of science and technology is a significant factor for the programming. The paper deals with the relationship between value sets in the programming. Thereby, it presents some ideas that can heighten the dimensions of value sets in the programming of training centers.

Keywords: Value-based approach; Programming; Training Center; Idea

Introduction

For centuries, the construction of training spaces has been concomitant with the considerations of special values. For example, along with their main function, traditional bazaars have provided spaces for training labor forces. In 17th-century Iran, these bazaars were a principal unit of civic centers, placed adjacent to educational buildings mostly [1]. This shows the consideration of value sets for planning training spaces in that era. With the advancement of science and technology, the creation of values has increased [2]. Values receive a lot of attention in various disciplines [3]. In this case, Hershberger argues value categories in architectural programming. Through considering the values in the programming, designers are able to schedule planning systematically. This shows the significant role of value sets in architectural programming [4]. Considering the creation is very important for the programming of training centers because the advancement of science and technology is manifest in their spaces. This strengthens the advantages of the advancement for planning training centers. Moreover, the advancement of science and technology has effects on training workforces. Due to the advancement, the shortage of qualified employees is a significant concern for companies in many countries [5]. This also shows the value of technical specialists' skills. For example, a person may obtain skills in maintaining mechanical equipment reducing the energy consumption of buildings. To work in the area of energy consumption, the person firstly becomes aware of the necessity of reducing the consumption, and the values derived from his work. That is, value sets have a significant role in both the spaces of training centers and the workforce skills. This illustrates the significance of a value-based approach to the programming of training centers.

Altogether, the key question in the programming of training centers is what issues do contribute to the studies on values. In response, it is pertinent to refer to the value categories presented by previous research. These categories can help programmers to engage with a variety of issues, with regarding the advancement of science and technology.

Identifying the purposes of the centers

The presence of users with different age groups initiates different physical needs in training centers. For example, the dimensions of work desks make different physical conditions between young and middle-aged people. Flexible furniture and spaces can fulfill the needs in the centers. However, it is essential to meet design standards for the users of the centers. This requires considering specific plans relying on the purposes of the centers. To do so, the main purposes in the programming of training centers must firstly become explicit. That is to say, the necessities, goals, and needs in the interaction between the centers and human, cultures, technologies, economies, aesthetics, temporalities, and environments become important. Occasionally, clients express some of the purposes through mentioning specific spaces. For example, spaces of classrooms, workshops, and counseling offices

usually convey definite goals in the centers. However, they may set special goals for the centers that are not common. These goals can affect the spatial relationships of their common spaces. For the programming of training centers, instructing workforces is commonly the prevailing purpose of the centers. Naturally, social interactions have a significant role in teaching and learning [6]. With this regard, the programming of the centers necessitates giving attention to the human issues of social groups. Notably, the social interactions between users should be considered in planning their indoor and outdoor spaces. These interactions have properties varied from face-to-face communications to virtual ones. In their programming, the social process of instruction and the progression relying on the interactions are significant. For this matter, it is beneficial to consider open areas for social interactions alongside the sites of the centers, connecting local and open spaces in their sites. Their social spaces also extend to their interior spaces. In this way, those spaces can maintain active atmospheres within the centers. Nevertheless, privacy and interpersonal space proximities are some other points for the issues [7]. As several social groups use training centers, their needs of proximities differ. Thence, the institutional values of the centers are close to other value sets.

Considering the relationships between value sets

It is necessary to specify functions in the programming of a building. In training centers, the proper relations between various functions need to receive a lot of attention. Due to the community use of the centers, the functions of local buildings heavily affect the relations between interior and exterior spaces. Their principal components - mostly instructional and employment counseling areas – have a determinant role in achieving the proper relations. Thereby, these parts determine the values of functions in their programming. Moreover, the psychological needs of the users of training centers convey values in their programming. On this issue, the considerations of private areas and the activity proximities are of the psychological characteristics being important for planning the centers. As an instance, providing access to a space for resting between training sessions is a response to fulfill these needs. Planning green spaces near the classrooms of centers usually strengthens this value. Admittedly, the landscape beauty of training centers and the provision of particular views bring a set of values to their sites for users. Another aspect is the land uses around the sites. In this regard, the design of the centers should offer pertinent relations between the centers and their local environments. Planning large interior spaces such as atriums can be considered for the extension of outside open spaces to the interiors. Thus, the visual continuity of their interior spaces to their landscape areas can contributes to the intensification of the relations. Moreover, the north-south planning of sites for building training centers is partially in contrast with the appropriate climatic conditions for some spaces. In this case, the placements of these spaces can be set into a recess from the west side of the sites for placing landscape elements. Nevertheless, the spaces on the west or east side usually easily take the advantage of breezes for natural ventilation. This way, the predominant extension of the centers in the north-south direction can embrace such environmental values. Notwithstanding, the form of the centers can correspond to renewable energy sources, such as photovoltaic panels. In this area, sloped roofs are capable to conduct rainwater in reservoirs. Altogether, climatic conditions can accord with aesthetic values in the programming of the centers. In the case of aesthetic issues, the determination of some relationships brings specific meanings to training centers. For example, the relationship between the employer and the employee has particular meanings. For training centers, architects can interpret the meanings as several ideas. On this issue, aspects of the meanings that make sense for users must be identifiable. For instance, combining instructional and counseling areas can follow a symbolic relationship. In addition, the formal properties of spaces are a significant factor for achieving aesthetic values [8]. Regarding the relationships, as the interior and exterior spaces conjoin in the centers meaningfully, architectural forms strengthen aesthetic values for the centers.

Particularly, training centers in the context of cities and neighborhoods can serve as symbols of training and instruction. This can engage with the values of permanence of the centers. The possibility of changing their spaces for future planning is also valuable. For example, the physical continuity of spaces next to each other can bring this value. Using portable partitions for separating spaces, such as offices, is one of the ideas for accomplishing the physical continuity. Thus, the flexibility of spaces deeply accords with sets of values in the centers. Furthermore, the historical contexts of training centers and the traditions emerging from them are important for their programming. Creating a meaningful connection between these centers and the old structures of the contexts can bring further value for them. In this case, users do not regard themselves as strangers in the centers, and their willingness to take part in the centers increases. It is also important to consider the history of financial resources and the residences' average income. For example, this matter shows to what extent the users of the centers can spend time and money on training in the centers. Additionally, the considerations of the local materials and historical industries bring values to the centers. Thereby, the centers can revive or maintain traditional and historical industries.

In addition, communities usually demand programs and policies for educational areas [9]. For training centers, it is necessary to consider the politics of communities in various cases. For example, a community prefers a certain commuting schedule that is effective for using the centers. Given the spacious areas of the centers, communities have a set of demands to do not avoid the boundaries of the centers. Therefore, these politics create values that are necessary for the success of these centers. By extension, national standards and codes are of cultural issues being important in the programming of constructions. In the case of training and education, high-quality standards strengthen professional outputs

How to cite this article: Shahani M. A Value-Based Approach to the Programming of Training Centers. Civil Eng Res J. 2021; 12(3): 555839.
DOI: 10.19080/CERJ.2021.12.555839

[10]. Due to the variety of spaces in training centers, a wide range of the standards should be considered in their programming. These standards have some cultural dimensions with impacts on the quality of built environments. For example, some standards and codes specify building height restrictions in different parts of cities. Alternatively, they may determine a certain number of open spaces or green spaces for users in the outdoor spaces of the centers. Therefore, these standards and codes contribute to the values of strong professional outputs. In addition, planning social spaces in the centers, such as mid-size seminars, strengthen using safe structures with specific spans. Generally, there is an interest to develop innovative and flexible learning spaces [11]. That is to say, the flexible learning spaces accords with the optimized consumption of materials and with safe structures. This can be achievable by using different types of structural systems. It is also a factor for reducing the construction cost of these centers. In this respect, complying with national and international standards can generally create values for the users' safety in the centers. Therefore, the values of safe structures can be in deep accordance with other values in these centers. Speaking of economic issues, the low cost of construction is usually one of the objectives for several projects. Maximizing efficiency and reducing unnecessary costs are in line with the proper planning of training centers for several social groups. Additionally, operation costs include various issues. Low operation costs can provide wider community use of the centers. For example, using the energies available in their environments minimizes their operation costs. Employing local industry in accordance with the cultural and climatic conditions of the centers can reduce these costs. Moreover, in training centers, some maintenance costs can minimize through recruiting native skilled workforces and employing local technologies. Due to climatic conditions, local construction materials provide considerable economic value in their regions. This is almost one of the purposes of training centers, related to the employments consistent with environmental conditions.

Furthermore, noise sources such as carriageways are fundamentally obstacles to the growth and development of instructional spaces. In this regard, these sources can determine the basis for the development of training centers. This way, major directions for these developments can be traceable in their programming. However, programming the developments of spaces is also related to the organization of spaces. For these centers, programming potential developments separately is beneficial for both instructional and counseling areas. Thereby, the possible developments of their spaces create values.

Thus, programmers engage with the relationship between issues in a value-based approach to the programming of training centers. The community use of the centers shows the importance of the programming, based on value sets. Programmers can employ these relationships to heighten the dimensions of values in building training centers.

Conclusion

As illustrated earlier, this study deals with value sets for the programming of training centers. In other words, it shows the relationship between human, environmental, economic, cultural, temporal, aesthetic, and safety issues in the programming of training centers. Regarding the community use of the centers, the value-based approach to the programming illustrates that a wide range of standards brings sets of values, considered for building the centers. It also shows that the increasing demands for flexible learning spaces can respond to several issues. The approach can link the values of planning the centers with the values of the workforces' skills. Hereby, Potential developments of the centers can conform to the advancement of science and technology. In regard of values, the relationship between the components of training centers can create special meanings. The value-based approach can deepen the meanings to the extent that the centers serve as the symbols of instructions and training in their regions. Moreover, the approach shows the importance of using local materials and historical industries, bringing consistency with environmental conditions to the centers. Thereby, it is possible to revive or maintain historical, local, and traditional industries.

References

1. Shahani M (2019) Pursuing the concept of existence in the designs of civic centers: the 17th-18th-century persia. Journal of architecture and urbanism.
2. Bowman C (2015) The role of technology in the creation and capture of value. Technology Analysis & Strategic Management 27: 237-248.
3. Graeber D (2001) Toward An Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of Our Own Dreams. New York (NY): Palgrave Macmillan; March L (1976) The logic of design and the question of value. In March L (Ed.), The Architecture of Form. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Moore MH (1995) Creating Public Value Strategic Management in Government. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, Chiaradia AJ, Sieh L, Plimmer F (2017) Values in urban design: A design studio teaching approach. Design Studies 49: 66-100.
4. Hershberger R (1999) Architectural Programming and Predesign Manager (1st ed.) Routledge.
5. (2008) United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), ILO, International Organization of Employers (IOE) and International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC). Green jobs: Towards decent work in a sustainable, low-carbon world (Geneva).
6. Edwards-Groves C (2017) Teaching and Learning as Social Interaction: Salience and Relevance in Classroom Lesson Practices. In: Grootenboer P, Edwards-Groves C, Choy S (Eds) Practice Theory Perspectives on Pedagogy and Education. Springer, Singapore.
7. Sundstrom E, Altman I (1976) Interpersonal relationships and personal space: Research review and theoretical model. Hum Ecol 4: 47-67.
8. Weddington HS (2004) Education as Aesthetic Experience: Interactions of Reciprocal Transformation. Journal of Transformative Education 2(2): 120-137.
9. Hill Collins P (2010) The New Politics of Community. American Sociological Review 75(1): 7-30.

How to cite this article: Shahani M. A Value-Based Approach to the Programming of Training Centers. Civil Eng Res J. 2021; 12(3): 555839.
DOI: 10.19080/CERJ.2021.12.555839

10. Jordan M, Wolever RQ, Lawson K, Moore M (2015) National Training and Education Standards for Health and Wellness Coaching: The Path to National Certification. Global Advances in Health and Medicine 4(3) 46-56.

11. Benade L (2021) Flexible and innovative learning spaces: An exploration of parental perspectives on change, consultation, and participation. European Educational Research Journal.

DOI: 10.19080/CERJ.2021.12.555839

How to cite this article: Shahani M. A Value-Based Approach to the Programming of Training Centers. Civil Eng Res J. 2021; 12(3): 555839. DOI: 10.19080/CERJ.2021.12.555839