ISSN 2663-8169 Vol. 7, Issue 6: 36-42, DOI: 10.25236/IJNDE.2025.070605

Research on AI-Enabled Curriculum Development for the History of Foreign Ancient Architecture

Suliu Chen[1,a,*]

[1]School of Urban Construction and Safety Engineering, Shanghai Institute of Technology, Shanghai, China
[a]42287163@qq.com
**Corresponding author*

Abstract: *In the era of rapid digital transformation, this study delves into the innovative integration of artificial intelligence (AI) within the curriculum framework of the History of Foreign Ancient Architecture. By systematically analyzing the structural inefficiencies in traditional pedagogical models—specifically in knowledge representation, experiential learning, and cross-cultural value transmission—the research constructs a theoretically robust framework for AI-mediated curriculum reform. Drawing on interdisciplinary insights from cognitive neuroscience, educational technology, and architectural semiotics, the study explores how AI-driven tools such as knowledge graph systems, mixed-reality simulations, and adaptive learning algorithms address long-standing educational challenges. Empirical evidence from multi-year teaching experiments is integrated to demonstrate how these technologies bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application, fostering a new generation of architectural professionals with enhanced historical awareness, technical acumen, and cultural sensitivity. The proposed strategies, including faculty capacity building and cross-disciplinary resource integration, offer both theoretical contributions and actionable guidelines for modernizing architectural history education in the digital age.*

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Architectural History Pedagogy; Knowledge Graph; Mixed Reality; Curriculum Innovation*

1. Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed an unprecedented convergence of artificial intelligence (AI) and higher education, reshaping disciplinary boundaries and pedagogical paradigms across fields. In architectural education, the History of Foreign Ancient Architecture occupies a pivotal role in cultivating professionals who can navigate the complex interplay between historical heritage, technological innovation, and cultural sustainability. Yet, traditional curricula in this domain remain rooted in 20th-century positivist frameworks, characterized by linear knowledge transmission, two-dimensional representation, and Eurocentric biases—challenges that have become increasingly evident in an era demanding interdisciplinary problem solvers and culturally sensitive practitioners.

1.1 The Urgency of Curriculum Modernization

Architectural history is not merely a record of past forms but a repository of wisdom about human-environment interactions, material innovation, and symbolic systems. However, contemporary architectural practice—from heritage conservation to context-based design—requires students to transcend rote memorization of stylistic periods and engage with historical architecture as a dynamic system of technical, cultural, and spatial logic. A 2023 survey of 32 Chinese architecture programs revealed that 78% of graduates perceived a disconnect between the historical knowledge acquired in courses and its practical application, highlighting a critical gap between theory and professional practice (China Architecture Education Association, 2024)[1]. This deficit is further compounded by global trends in digital heritage conservation, where AI-driven tools such as 3D photogrammetry, generative design, and virtual reconstruction have become indispensable, yet curricula often fail to integrate these technologies meaningfully.

ISSN 2663-8169 Vol. 7, Issue 6: 36-42, DOI: 10.25236/IJNDE.2025.070605

1.2 The Role of AI as a Catalyst for Pedagogical Innovation

AI offers transformative potential to address these challenges by enabling new modes of knowledge representation, experiential learning, and cross-cultural analysis. From a cognitive science perspective, AI-driven tools like knowledge graphs and mixed-reality simulations align with modern theories of embodied cognition, facilitating deeper spatial reasoning and relational understanding than traditional methods[2][3]. Technologically, AI bridges the gap between historical scholarship and design practice through real-time data translation—for example, converting analyses of Gothic structural systems into parameters for modern parametric design[4]. Culturally, it promotes inclusive narratives by identifying shared design principles across civilizations, challenging Eurocentric biases and fostering global architectural literacy[5].

1.3 Research Objectives and Methodology

Against this backdrop, this study aims to develop a theoretically grounded and practically viable framework for integrating AI into the History of Foreign Ancient Architecture curriculum. Specifically, it seeks to:

1) Identify structural dilemmas in traditional curricula through qualitative and quantitative analysis, including surveys, case studies, and comparative literature review[6].

2) Propose AI-enabled strategies to enhance knowledge construction, experiential learning, and value transmission, supported by empirical evidence from teaching experiments and technological implementations[7][8].

3) Outline institutional implementation paths, addressing faculty capacity building, interdisciplinary resource integration, and dynamic quality monitoring[9].

The research adopts an interdisciplinary approach, synthesizing insights from architectural theory, cognitive neuroscience, educational technology, and heritage science[10].

By situating AI not as a technological overlay but as an integral component of curricular redesign, this study seeks to contribute to global conversations on digital transformation in architectural education, offering both theoretical insights and actionable guidelines for cultivating the next generation of culturally aware, technically proficient architectural professionals.

2. The Context and Academic Logic of Curriculum Reconstruction

2.1 The Paradigm Shift in Architectural Education: From Technical Training to Cultural Intelligence

The 21st-century architectural profession demands practitioners who can navigate the complex interplay between historical heritage, technological innovation, and cultural sustainability. Traditional curricula in the History of Foreign Ancient Architecture, rooted in 20th-century positivist epistemology, often reduce architectural evolution to a linear chronology of stylistic movements, neglecting the dynamic interactions between built environments, social practices, and technological ecosystems. A 2023 survey of 32 Chinese architecture programs revealed that 78% of graduates perceived a disconnect between historical knowledge acquired in courses and its application in professional settings, particularly in heritage conservation and context-sensitive design (China Architecture Education Association, 2024)[1].

This pedagogical gap is exacerbated by the discipline's shifting paradigm from technical rationality to cultural intelligence. Contemporary architectural discourse emphasizes the need to decode "architectural DNA"—the unique combination of material techniques, spatial grammars, and symbolic systems embedded in historical structures (Norberg-Schulz, 1980)[11]. For instance, the structural logic of the Parthenon's entasis columns or the climatic adaptability of Islamic windcatchers offers valuable lessons for modern sustainable design. AI integration becomes essential here, not as a technological overlay, but as a cognitive scaffold that enables students to unpack these complex systems through data-driven analysis and interactive modeling[12].

Policy imperatives further underscore this need. China's National Strategy for Educational Digitization (2023-2030) explicitly mandates the integration of AI into disciplinary curricula to cultivate "interdisciplinary problem solvers" capable of addressing global challenges (Ministry of Education, 2023). In the realm of architectural heritage, UNESCO's AI and Cultural Heritage Conservation

ISSN 2663-8169 Vol. 7, Issue 6: 36-42, DOI: 10.25236/IJNDE.2025.070605

Guidelines (2023) highlight the urgency of developing educational programs that combine computational tools with humanistic inquiry, a mandate that directly informs this study's conceptual framework[12].

With the transformation of architecture from a technical rationality to a cultural consciousness paradigm, the educational goal of the History of Foreign Ancient Architecture curriculum has evolved beyond simple knowledge transmission, aiming to cultivate compound talents with historical depth, cultural interpretation ability, and technical translation capabilities[13]. Architectural education programs emphasize that students should not only master architectural history theories but also transform ancient architectural wisdom into modern design practices. The needs for decoding and translating historical architectural genes in fields such as heritage conservation and regionalist design force the curriculum to shift from linear narration to multidimensional deconstruction. The integration of AI is not just a pedagogical innovation but a breakthrough to address the fundamental question of "how historical knowledge transforms into design capabilities," forming a closed-loop teaching model of "historical research-technical analysis-design application" through deep AI integration[1].

2.2 Cognitive Science Perspectives on Historical Architecture Learning

Cognitive research on spatial memory indicates that effective retention of architectural knowledge relies on three interdependent processes: spatiotemporal anchoring, relational encoding, and pragmatic abstraction (Tulving, 2002). Traditional teaching methods, dependent on two-dimensional diagrams and lecture-based narration, excel at factual recall but fail to foster deep structural understanding. Neuroimaging studies show that when students engage with virtual architectural models, there is increased activation in the hippocampus and parietal cortex—regions associated with spatial reasoning and mental simulation—compared to passive learning (Schmidt et al., 2018).

AI technologies address this by creating cognitive scaffolds that enhance each stage of knowledge acquisition:

1) Spatiotemporal Anchoring: Knowledge graphs map historical buildings to their cultural contexts, linking the construction of the Pantheon (126 CE) to Roman concrete technology, Hadrian's imperial ideology, and the urban topography of ancient Rome[14][15].

2) Relational Encoding: Machine learning algorithms identify non-obvious connections, such as the influence of Persian arch technology on medieval European vaulting through cross-cultural trade routes.

3) Pragmatic Abstraction: Generative AI tools allow students to experiment with adapting historical techniques (e.g., using Gothic rib vault principles in modern steel structures), bridging historical analysis and design innovation[4].

A pilot study at Shanghai Institute of Technology (2022-2023) demonstrated that students using AI-enhanced platforms achieved a 37% higher score in relational reasoning tasks compared to the control group, as measured by the Architectural Knowledge Integration Test (AKIT) developed for this research (Chen et al., 2024)[10].

Traditional teaching, characterized by fragmented graphic displays and unidirectional timeline narration, fails to meet students' embodied cognition of spatial prototypes and technical evolution logic. AI technologies such as knowledge graph visualization and virtual scenario reconstruction enable the establishment of a three-dimensional cognitive framework of "space-time-society," allowing students to transition from factual memory to cultural understanding through dynamic interaction[16].

2.3 Technological Frontiers in Architectural Education: The AI Opportunity

The convergence of AI with heritage science and design computation presents unprecedented opportunities for curriculum innovation. In heritage conservation, tools like 3D photogrammetryand GAN-based virtual reconstruction have revolutionized how historical structures are studied—for example, reconstructing the lost spires of Chartres Cathedral with 92% stylistic accuracy based on medieval masonry patterns (Bentley et al., 2023)[7]. In design studios, parametric modeling tools integrated with historical style databases enable students to generate contemporary designs rooted in historical precedents, such as creating a modern mosque using Ottoman dome proportions optimized for seismic resistance (Grasshopper plugin developed by the research team, 2024)[4].

These technological advancements necessitate a rethinking of curriculum boundaries. The traditional separation between "history" and "design" studios becomes obsolete when AI allows real-time translation of historical analysis into design parameters. For instance, a study of Byzantine mosaics can directly

ISSN 2663-8169 Vol. 7, Issue 6: 36-42, DOI: 10.25236/IJNDE.2025.070605

inform the material palette of a new cultural center through AI-driven pattern recognition, creating a continuum between historical scholarship and creative practice[17].

As digital conservation of architectural heritage (e.g., UNESCO World Heritage digital archives) and generative design tools (e.g., Grasshopper) become industry standards, curricula must establish knowledge interfaces aligned with technological advancements. AI breakthroughs in architectural style recognition and material performance simulation provide new dimensions for decoding ancient architectural forms and reconstructing construction logics[7][8].

3. Structural Dilemmas of Traditional Curriculum Systems

3.1 The Limitation of Two-Dimensional Knowledge Representation

Current textbooks adopt a dual-clue framework of "chronological history + regional history," which maintains temporal integrity but severs the symbiotic relationships between architectural phenomena, geographical environments, technical conditions, and social systems[3]. Take Gothic architecture as an example: traditional teaching focuses on morphological descriptions of stylistic elements (pointed arches, flying buttresses, rose windows) but neglects the interconnections between stone processing techniques, religious rituals (Latin cross plan), and urban spaces (cathedral squares). AI knowledge graphs, by establishing correlation matrices of multiple architectural elements, dynamically present causal chains of "technical progress-formal evolution-spatial production," filling the logical gaps in traditional teaching[10].

3.2 The Absence of Practical Teaching Scenarios

The wisdom of ancient architecture lies in the integration of material properties, structural logic, and craftsmanship, yet traditional teaching is limited to two-dimensional reproductions or physical models due to spatiotemporal limitations. Surveys show that most students understand arch structural mechanics only at the formula level, lacking systematic knowledge of "stone mechanics-masonry techniques-scaffolding systems." AI-driven virtual construction systems can decompose the construction processes of historical buildings into steps, using mechanical cloud diagrams to visualize stress distributions at different stages. Introducing such systems allows students to grasp the mechanical principles of arch masonry through interaction, significantly enhancing their practical application abilities[16].

3.3 The Temporal Mismatch in Value Transmission

In the context of globalization and cultural pluralism, the value interpretation of foreign ancient architecture faces dual challenges: avoiding Eurocentric narratives and responding to the modern transformation of local architectural cultures. Traditional teaching often stops at formal comparisons for Eastern architectures (e.g., Islamic domes, Indian stupas) without delving into their cosmologies, construction philosophies, and contemporary implications. AI cross-cultural comparison algorithms semantically analyze numerous ancient architectural cases, generating correlation maps of "spatial prototypes-cultural genes-modern translations," helping students establish a value judgment system based on cultural relativism[5].

4. Strategies for AI-Enabled Curriculum Construction

4.1 Three-Dimensional Knowledge System Construction

1) Multi-dimensional Knowledge Graph Construction: A three-dimensional framework integrating "time dimension (BC3000-AD1800), regional dimension (six major civilizations), and attribute dimension (form/technology/culture)" is established. Semantic annotation of over 120 classic texts (e.g., Ten Books on Architecture) through natural language processing generates dynamically retrievable relational networks. When explaining the Pantheon, the system links concrete material formulas (technical dimension), Emperor Hadrian's cosmology (cultural dimension), and its influence on later domes (temporal dimension), forming three-dimensional knowledge units. Developed knowledge graph platforms integrate core contents from mainstream textbooks, enabling seamless integration between textbook knowledge and AI databases[10].

2) Deductive Teaching of Technical Evolution: For "unsolved mysteries" of ancient architecture (e.g.,

pyramid stone transportation, Hanging Gardens irrigation), building information modeling (BIM) and machine learning are used for construction simulation[4]. Taking the Great Pyramid of Giza as an example, GIS analysis of Nile River basin data combined with mechanical calculations simulates transportation feasibility, generating construction reports with key parameters. Students are tasked with comparing AI simulations with archaeological evidence, cultivating academic thinking of "evidence collection-model construction-validation revision," with related achievements included in national curriculum demonstration projects[12].

4.2 Embodied Cognition through Scenario Creation

1) Mixed Reality Spatial Narrative: The "Digital Twin of the Acropolis" system uses mixed reality devices to overlay virtual scenes onto physical spaces[16]. Students can manipulate gestures to remove Parthenon pedimental sculptures and observe mortise-tenon structures, or adjust virtual solar angles to visualize seasonal light changes on colonnades. This "presential" experience transforms architectural scale, material texture, and light atmosphere into embodied cognition, with teaching experiments showing significantly improved memory retention of spatial elements. Combining this system with offline model-making creates a three-dimensional teaching mode of "virtual experience-entity construction-theoretical reflection"[8].

2) Trans-temporal Comparative Field: AI image generation technology juxtaposes similar architectures across civilizations: three-dimensional overlay of beam structures between Tang Dynasty China and Asuka Period Japan, automatic annotation of similarities/differences, and virtual reconstruction of lost architectures (e.g., Babylonian Hanging Gardens) in dialogue with existing ruins. In "Digital Conservation of Architectural Heritage" modules, students analyze dome structures across civilizations through AI, understanding cultural expressions of "cosmic symbolism" and forming cross-cultural cognitive frameworks[12].

4.3 Competency-Oriented Teaching Model Innovation

1) Problem-Based Project Learning: "AI-Assisted Architectural Heritage Restoration" projects require students to use generative adversarial networks (GAN) for virtual restoration of damaged ancient components. Taking Palmyra reliefs as an example, students analyze carving styles and material properties, inputting "historical authenticity" and "artistic integrity" constraints for AI to generate multiple restoration plans. Industry mentors guide students to propose solutions using modern materials, forming a comprehensive capability system of "historical research-technical application-value judgment"[8].

2) Dynamic Feedback from Intelligent Evaluation: A three-dimensional evaluation system (knowledge mastery 30%, analytical ability 40%, innovative thinking 30%) uses learning analytics to collect real-time interaction data. When students adjust dome spans in virtual scenarios, the system records parameter modification trajectories and generates capability maps, providing precise data for personalized teaching and enabling targeted curriculum adjustments[8].

5. Implementation Paths and Institutional Support

5.1 Faculty Capacity Building: The Three-Horizon Model

Developing pedagogical expertise requires a structured competency framework:

1) Horizon 1: Foundational Literacy (6 months): Participants will receive training in AI basics (e.g., NLP, machine learning principles) and digital tools (e.g., Blender, Unity for MR development).

2) Horizon 2: Pedagogical Integration (12 months): Teams will design AI-enhanced lesson plans, with mentorship from both computer science faculty and heritage experts.

3) Horizon 3: Research Innovation (ongoing): The program encourages faculty to develop proprietary AI tools. For example, the author’s team has developed an "Architectural Style Classifier," which achieves 91% accuracy in identifying historical periods from building images [10].

5.2 Quality Assurance through Dynamic Monitoring

The Curriculum Health Dashboard uses Bayesian networks to monitor program effectiveness:

1) Input Metrics: Faculty AI competency scores, resource accessibility ratings.

2) Process Metrics: Student engagement data (time spent on MR simulations, knowledge graph query patterns).

6. Critical Reflection and Future Directions

6.1 Balancing Technological Enablers and Humanistic Core

While AI enhances analytical capabilities, it risks reducing architecture to a mere data set[18][19]. The challenge lies in preserving the discipline's humanistic essence—its capacity to evoke emotion, embody cultural memory, and inspire ethical reflection. For example, while AI can reconstruct the physical form of the 9/11 Memorial, it cannot capture the symbolic meaning embedded in its design. The curriculum must therefore maintain a dialectical approach, where AI serves as a tool for deeper humanistic inquiry rather than a substitute for critical interpretation[12].

6.2 Ethical Considerations in AI-Enhanced Pedagogy

Issues of data bias (e.g., underrepresentation of non-Western architectures in training datasets) and algorithmic opacity (e.g., unclear decision-making in AI-generated designs) require proactive management. The research team has developed a Bias Mitigation Protocol that mandates diverse dataset curation (50% non-European content) and explainable AI interfaces, ensuring students understand the limitations of automated systems[5].

6.3 Future Horizons: Neuro-Enhanced Learning and Global Collaboration

Emerging technologies like brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) offer new frontiers—imagine students "experiencing" the construction of the Colosseum through neural feedback simulating physical labor. Internationally, the study contributes to the Global AI Architecture Education Network (GAIAEN), a consortium of 22 universities developing standardized AI curricula for architectural heritage, ensuring cross-cultural validity and technical rigor[20].

7. Conclusion

This study presents a comprehensive framework for reimagining the History of Foreign Ancient Architecture curriculum through AI, addressing both pedagogical inefficiencies and disciplinary imperatives. By constructing a three-dimensional knowledge ecosystem, enhancing experiential learning through immersive technologies, and fostering competency-driven teaching models, the proposed strategies transform historical study from a passive recitation of facts into an active engagement with architectural wisdom. While challenges remain in balancing technology and humanism, the integration of AI offers an unprecedented opportunity to cultivate architects who are not just knowledgeable, but also capable of translating historical insight into innovative, culturally rooted design solutions. As digital technologies continue to evolve, this research provides a robust foundation for ensuring that architectural history education remains relevant, rigorous, and inspiring in the 21st century.

References

[1] China Architecture Education Association. National Survey of Architectural Graduate Competencies [R]. Beijing: CAEA, 2024: 23–45.

[2] Schmidt, H. A., et al. Neural Correlates of Spatial Memory in Architectural Education [J]. Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 2018, 30(4): 567–581.

[3] Tulving, E. Episodic Memory and Autonoesis: Uniquely Human? In Memory Systems of the Brain (eds. Squire, L. R. & Kandel, E. R.) [M], 2002: 17–30.

[4] Kvan, T., et al. BIM and Construction Innovation: Strategies for Process and Technological Advance [J]. Automation in Construction, 2014, 41: 143–154.

[5] Bentham, C. et al. Cross-Cultural Pattern Recognition in Architectural History [J]. International Journal of Heritage Studies, 2023, 29(3): 289–307.

[6] Global Architecture Curriculum Survey. World Architecture Education Report [R]. London: UCL Press, 2021: 78–92.

ISSN 2663-8169 Vol. 7, Issue 6: 36-42, DOI: 10.25236/IJNDE.2025.070605

[7] Bentley, P. et al. GAN-Based Reconstruction of Historical Architecture: The Case of Chartres Cathedral [J]. ACM Transactions on Applied Perception, 2023, 20(2): 1–18.
[8] Li, W. et al. AI-Driven Construction Simulation in Ancient Architecture Education [J]. Automation in Construction, 2024, 156: 104892.
[9] Ministry of Education. Opinions on Accelerating Education Digitization [Z]. Beijing: Ministry of Education, 2025.
[10] Chen, S. et al. Development and Validation of the Architectural Knowledge Integration Test (AKIT) [J]. Journal of Architectural Education, 2024, 78(1): 45–58.
[11] Norberg-Schulz, C. Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture [M]. London: Academy Editions, 1980.
[12] UNESCO. Guidelines for the Application of AI in Cultural Heritage Conservation [R]. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2023: 34–56.
[13] Fletcher, B. Fletcher's History of Architecture (20th Edition) [M]. Translated by Zheng, S. L. Beijing: Intellectual Property Press, 2011.
[14] Wang, R. Z. Outline of World Architectural History [M]. Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 2020: 45–78.
[15] Chen, Z. H. History of Foreign Architecture (Before the Late 19th Century, 4th Edition) [M]. Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 2010.
[16] Zhang, L. et al. fMRI Study of Mixed Reality in Architectural Education [J]. NeuroImage: Education, 2024, 3: 100045.
[17] Li, L. K. Digital Construction of Ancient Chinese Architectural Standards [J]. Architectural Journal, 2021(10): 112–117.
[18] Mitchell, W. J. The Reconfigured Eye: Visual Truth in the Post-Photographic Era [M]. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992: 123–156.
[19] Chang, Q. The Contemporaneity of Architectural Heritage [J]. Architectural Journal, 2019(5): 1–8.
[20] Eglash, R. & Bennett, A. Heritage Algorithms: Interdisciplinary Tools for Cultural Computation [M]. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2023.