

Research Paper

Identification and Ranking Factors Affecting the Architecture of Environmental Quality in Rural Planning (Case Study: Shahriar Village in Flard County, Lordegan Township)

Kazem Rostami¹, *Mehdi Pourtahari², Abdolreza Rokneddin Eftekhari³

1. PhD graduate, Department of Geography and Rural Planning, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Associate Professor, Department of Geography and Rural Planning, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.
3. Professor, Department of Geography and Rural Planning, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.



Citation: Rostami, K., Pourtahari, M., & Rokneddin Eftekhari, A.R. (2019). [Identification and Ranking Factors Affecting the Architecture of Environmental Quality in Rural Planning (Case Study: Shahriar Village in Flard County, Lordegan Township) (Persian)]. *Journal of Rural Research*, 10(3), 368-381, <http://dx.doi.org/10.22059/jrur.2018.248159.1196>

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22059/jrur.2018.248159.1196>

Received: 24 Dec. 2017
Accepted: 27 May 2018

ABSTRACT

Paying attention to the quality of the environment and its related concerns are the main attributes of contemporary modern life, especially in rural areas. The realization of this type of quality in rural areas also requires compliance with the architecture of environment quality in rural planning. In this regard, determining priorities and ranking the aspects of this architecture (from the perspective of people and local experts) is important in the process of rural planning. The research is based on two central questions of what is the architecture of environment quality. And which one is the priority of planning? Therefore, the village of Shahriyar, in the Falard of Lordegan (with 2342 inhabitants), was selected to answer the questions and drawing a perspective on the architecture of environmental quality. So far, a number of executive plans in the form of rural planning have been implemented in this village. A total number of 6 workgroups with 36 participants were selected through purposeful sampling. In this research, both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect and analyze data and answer the questions. Based on local people and experts, 24 indicators in the architecture of environmental quality in rural planning were identified, in which 11 indicators were related to principles, seven indicators were in the field of framework and, six in the field of process. Indicators of each index were determined and grouped according to the Likert scale from very low to very high. The results showed that principles, processes, and frameworks are ranked first to third, respectively, in the architecture of environment quality in rural planning.

Key words:

Environmental Quality, Environmental Quality Architecture, Rural Planning, *Shahriar Village*

Copyright © 2019, Journal of Rural Research. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-noncommercial 4.0 International License which permits copy and redistribute the material just in noncommercial usages, provided the original work is properly cited.

Extended Abstract

1. Introduction

P

aying attention to the quality of the environment and its related concerns

are the main attributes of contemporary modern life, especially in rural areas. The participation of stakeholders and residents in the process of rural planning can ensure that environmental quality is achieved. The realization of this type of quality in rural areas also requires compliance with the architecture of environment quality in rural plan-

* Corresponding Author:

Mehdi Pourtahari, PhD

Address: Department of Geography and Rural Planning, Faculty of Literature, Tarbiat Modarres University, Tehran, Iran.

Tel: +98 (912) 2817923

E-mail: mahdit@modares.ac.ir

ning. In this regard, determining priorities and ranking the aspects of this architecture (from the perspective of people and local experts) is important in the process of rural planning. Therefore, the current research aims to answer the following two questions:

A) From the perspective of villagers and local experts, what are the most important indicators and elements of the architecture of environmental quality (principles, framework, and process) in rural planning?

B) from the perspective of villagers and local experts, what indicator has the highest value among the elements that make up the architecture of the environmental quality (principles, framework and process) in rural planning?

2. Methodology

According to the main objective of this study, which seeks to identify and rank the indicators of environmental quality architecture in rural planning, the research method is divided into two distinct parts:

Part one: In this section, to answer the first question (from the perspective of villagers and local experts), the most important indicators and elements of the architecture of environmental quality (principles, framework, and process) in rural planning were identified. Using a qualitative method and focusing on collaborative workshops and local informants, data were analyzed and analyzed. In this section, people, local experts, and managers formed six working groups with 36 members.

The second part sheds light on the second question of the research, which was about prioritizing the indicators of environmental quality architecture in rural planning. Based on a quantitative approach, we tried to analyze the digital information obtained from the workgroups. The Likert spectrum was used to present environmental quality indicators and its three sub-sets, including principles, frameworks, and processes in the workshops. A score was obtained from the views of participants in each aspect that formed the initial matrix of decision. Also, after collecting data and ranking factors contributing to the quality of the environment, the modified method was used.

3. Results

In order to answer the research questions, we first attempted to answer the following question: Which subjects are important under the topic of the indicators and elements of the environmental quality architecture (principles, framework, and process)? Do you know what fac-

tors make up the architecture of environmental quality (principles, frameworks, and processes) in rural planning, and which one is more important?

4. Discussion

findings of this study can be described in two distinct processes:

A) Quality Results: These findings are the result of discussions arisen in the six working groups, which focused on the following items. First, the identification of the indicators of principles, frameworks, and processes in environmental quality architecture. Second, determining examples presented in the form of indicators.

B) Quantitative findings: A modified quantitative method was used to rank the determinants of environmental quality architecture. Based on local people and experts, the environmental quality architecture indicators in rural planning were determined. Its aspects (principles, framework, and process) were ranked. During workshops, dimensions of the architecture of environmental quality were discussed in three areas of principles, framework, and process. The research questions were addressed in these workshops.

5. Conclusion

We identified 24 indicators for the three main fields of environmental quality architecture:

The field of principles: comprehensiveness, participation, commitment, realism, continuity, efficiency, effectiveness, coordination, logic, transparency and interaction.

The field of frameworks: vision, integration, orbital priority, localism, central economics, sequencing, politics.

The field of the processes: information accessibility, future orientation, customer orientation, orbital management, capacity measurement.

Finally, the triple aspects of principles, framework and process were ranked from the point of view of the people and local experts. Accordingly, principles, processes, and frameworks were ranked first to third, respectively, in the architecture of environment quality in rural planning.

Acknowledgments

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declared no conflicts of interest