THE DESIGN STUDIO IN SELECTED SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE IN SOUTH-WEST NIGERIA: A Study of Pedagogy, Culture and Environment

A PhD Thesis

By

ADERONMU, Adewuyi Peter

MAT NO: CUGP/05/122

Submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies, Covenant University

In Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

in Architecture, Covenant University, Canaan Land, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria.

July, 2013

DECLARATION

I, Aderonmu, Adewuyi Peter, declare that the work referred to in this thesis was carried out entirely by me under the supervision of Prof. E.A. Adeyemi (Main Supervisor) and Prof. O. Amole (Co-Supervisor) both of the Department of Architecture, Covenant University, Canaan Land, Ota, Ogun State. Therefore, no portion of the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other University or other institution of learning. All sources of scholarly information referred to in this thesis were properly acknowledged.

_____

ADERONMU, Adewuyi Peter

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled The Design Studio in Selected Schools of Architecture in South-West Nigeria: A Study of Pedagogy, Culture and Environment carried out by Aderonmu, Adewuyi Peter under my supervision meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Architecture of the Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria.

I certify that it has not been submitted in part or full for the award of the degree of PhD or any other degree in this or any other University, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Prof. E.A.Adeyemi

Main Supervisor

Prof. S.A Amole

Co-Supervisor

Dr. A.B. Adeboye

HOD, Architecture

Examiner

DEDICATION

To Almighty God for His unending grace and ever present attendance to all that concerns me in my life's journey, and to My virtuous wife, Florence Oyekemi, My Covenant children, God'sFavour, God'sElect, God'sGrace, My Mother, Bamidele and My late Father Aderemi Bolakale Aderonmu.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To write a concise list of people to whom heartfelt gratitude should be expressed to in a study of this nature, especially the kind that took a number of years to complete is almost as experiential as the study itself. Of a task like this, oversight and omission are inevitable for one to find exact meaning and expression for contributions of people to this work. I therefore appreciate that I may not be able to acknowledge all worthies in this page, but rest in the confidence that such worthies would understand and bear with my limitation in this regard.

My heart-felt thanks go to my supervisors Prof. (Emeritus) Ekundayo Adeyinka (The first Nigerian Professor of Architecture and African Doyen of Architecture), renowned Prof Adebayo Amole and Dr. Mrs Amole for their attendant guidance and encouragement during the course of my study. I really appreciate you for always encouraging me and providing direction. My thanks go to Covenant University for the opportunity granted me to undertake this work. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my colleagues and staff in the department of Architecture Covenant University, Ota, who contributed in one way or the other in completing this thesis. Particularly to Dr. Adeboye (H.O.D), Dr. A.A. Taiwo, Dr Geshinde Abiodun Mathew (psychology department, C.U), Dr. Ibem, Dr. Oluwatayo, Arc Dare-Abel and Dr. Alagbe and for their technical supports, Dr. Timothy Anake who sparkled light on the narrow path when I was confused on the trend line mathematics equations that emerged in this work; as well as my office mates Arc O.J Ediae, Arc (Mrs) Fulani and Arc (Mrs) Jegede for the friendly and favourable office atmosphere they provided.

There are many other great people who in many ways contributed to the success of this thesis. I

am grateful to Dr. Aduwo, Arc. Adewale, Arc. Izobo-Martins, Arc. Ezema, Mr Adegoke all of Architecture Department, Covenant university, Ota. I would like to thank Arc Yetunde, Arc. Oluseyi Adeoye, Department of Architecture, L.A.U.T.E.C.H, Ogbomoso, Staff of Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Students of Architecture, O.A.U , Ile-Ife Campus, Dr. Ajiboye, the Head of Department of Architecture, O.A.U, Ile-Ife, Dr. Ilesanmi, Arc. Jaiyeoba, Arc. Bukola Adisa, Mr Austin (the O.A.U architecture students' association president-IFASA) for their assistance and encouragement which greatly inspired me during my field work in a bid to completing this thesis.

Without the encouragement of my wife and my children, I would not have reached this stage of work this time; they kept my spirit bubbling and high sounding in the realities of achievement especially when I was almost giving up in the most difficult period. I am also grateful for their understanding and kindest disposition. They bore with me through the days when I denied them of those precious minutes I could have spent with them.

Through it all, I owe my life and my all to God Almighty who has never left me stranded in the course of my journey in life and most particularly over trying period when this thesis work tarried. It is a vision and tangible substance for appointed time, though it tarried, it will not tarry, at the end it shall speak and will not lie, but come to pass for the global world to celebrate.

ABSTRACT

The concerns for sustainability in architectural education have become the subjects of global discussion which has prompted the stakeholders into researches, debates, negotiations, declarations and policy formulation in Nigeria and other parts of the world. The curriculum of architectural design studio has been based on design studio model which focuses on "learning by doing". In the course of advancement for the best practices, some revolutionary practices evolved over time as a reaction to the criticism against traditional practices in architectural design studio pedagogy, culture and environment. Although, several revolutionary practices may have been developed and employed by different design studio teachers across the schools, but little or no empirical documentation was made in the time past. This study, therefore, critically examined the architectural design studio in some selected schools of architecture in Nigeria in order to describe its characteristics in relation to pedagogy, culture and environment. The research methodology employed a survey research design strategy; the primary data were sourced by the use of questionnaires, observations, focus group, and oral interviews. The secondary data was sourced from the literature, archives, government reports and records. Also, the sampling frame consisted of the design studios, students and teachers in the selected design studios; the unit of analysis was obtained for the teachers and students, design studios of year three (3), four (4) and masters classes (300,400 or 500 and M.Sc. Classes). A multi-stage stratified purposive sampling technique was adopted. Questionnaire responses were analysed using SPSS while content analysis was used for the interviews and observations.

Some findings among many others, showed that, for teachers, the sex distribution was 69.4% male, 30.6% female; with highest proportion of female teachers in CU (38.9%). And for students across the selected schools, the percentages of sex distribution were 69.1% male and 30.9% female. However, in the revolutionary pedagogic models, generally across the four schools, the dominant pedagogic practice was found in participatory model as O.A.U was found with most dominant characteristics than the three other schools. Both the CU teachers and students had dominant characteristics in Analogical model, and LAUTECH with least characteristics of these models. Most of these investigated schools have some inadequacies; ranging from deficiencies in privacy and security, protection of workspace and equipment to studio building services. Also, majority of the respondents felt inadequate with design studio culture life in the selected studios.

The study found significant differences in socio-economic characteristics of students and teachers, personality characteristics of students and teachers in the different dimensions of orientation and perception to design studios. The different levels of significant indices were found for pedagogic practices, culture and environment across the four schools. The findings also show the most significant predictors of pedagogy in three hierarchical orders: the first order contained (i) the Demystification of studio culture (ii) Motivational Factors and (iii) studio Culture ethics and Code of conduct. The second order was the mean adequacies for lighting (Beta Value=.217, F-Value=53, 434, df=2 and significant Value= .000), auxiliary facilities (Beta Value=-.130, F-Value=29.227, df=2and significant value= .000), studio building services (Beta Value=-.113, F-Value=17.000,df=5,and significant Value=.000) and the third order was REGR factor score 6 for analysis 1(Beta Value=.101, F-Value=26.334, df=2, and significant value=.000), REGR factor score 7 for analysis 1(Beta Value=.091, F-Value=18.275, df=2 and significant Value=.000) and REGR factor score 5 for analysis 1(Beta Value=.077, F-Value=13.625,df=1 and significant value=.000). This study revealed that the different design studio practices employed in the four selected schools had performed differently in terms of teachers and students' personality characteristics, pedagogic practices, culture, and environments. The parametric measures evolved in these findings can be used as a valid fundamental basis in the empirical analysis of inquiries perquisites to the architectural epistemology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page ---------- i

Declaration.....ii

Certification ---------- iii

Dedication ---------- iv

Acknowledgement ----------v

Abstract ---------- vii

Table of Contents.....ix

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.0 Background of the Study ----------1

1.1 Research Aim ---------- 11

-1.2 Research Objectives ---------- 11

1.3 Statement of Research Problem..... 11

1.4 Research Questions..... 16

1.5 Justification of the Research---------- 16

1.6 Scope of the Study.....17

1.7 Summary.....17

Chapter 2 THE CONTEXT OF STUDY----------18

2.0. Introduction…….....18

2.1. Basic Information on the selected schools 18

2.2 Administrative Setting of Selected Schools.....18

2.3 Demographics and Socio-economic Characteristics of Selected Schools.....19

2.4 Architectural Design Studio in Selected Schools.....20

2.4.1 Architectural Education in Nigerian Schools: Historical Perspective 20

2.4.2 The Nigerian Education Policy (NPE), Vocational and Technical Education Policy, Nigerian Institute of Architects and Architects Registration Council Education Policies 23

2.4.3.1 Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State.....27

2.4.3.2 Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State.....29

2.4.3.3 Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State 29

2.4.3.4 University Of Lagos, Lagos, Lagos State.....31

2.5 Summary…… ……....31

Chapter 3 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....32

Introduction…….....32

3.1 Conceptual Clarification of Architectural Design Studio.....33

3.2 Pedagogy of Architectural Design Studio.....37

3.2.1 Teaching and Design Process.....39

3.2.2 Teaching Architectural Design Studio: Research and Practice Model.....44

3.2.3 Pedagogic Status and its Criticism.....46

3.2.4 Pedagogic Lessons from New Castle School of Architecture .....……49

3.2.5 General Web-based Pedagogic Education Model.....50

3.2.6 Teachers' Performance Objective.....……....51

3.2.7 Learning Task.....47

3.3.0 General Educational Assessment .....……...……...48

3.4.0 Traditional Assessment Method of Project.....……..…..53

3.4.1 Effective Criticism in Architectural Design Studio Evaluations 55

3.4.2 Jury Criticism as Activator of Individual's Latent Potentials.....56

3.5.0 Architectural Design Studio Culture 58

3.5.1 Categorical Analysis of General Culture.....58

3.5.2 General Studio Culture Frame Work.....60

3.5.3 Studio Culture.....61

3.5.3 History of the Architectural Design Studio Culture Initiative.....61

3.5.5 The University Culture- Lessons from Review of Roger Williams University School of Architecture.....64

3.5.6 Lessons from the Mission and Philosophy of Roger Williams School.....64

3.5.7 Missionary Culture.....65

3.6.0 The Studio Environment.....66

3.6.1 Environment Theories Scales and Dimensions.....68

3.6.2 The Psycho-social Environment: Historical Perspective.....68

3.6.2.1 Perceptual Indexes to Measure Environment Dimensions.....70

3.6.3 Virtual Environment.....70

3.6.4 The Physical Environment.....71

3.6.5 Learning Environment Scales.....72

3.7.0 Concise Findings from the Literature (Summary).....73

Chapter 4 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK..... 75

4.0 Introduction.....75

4.1 The Pedagogical Theories: Teaching, Learning and Assessment.....75

4.1.1 Behaviourism.....76

4.1.1.1 Instructional Teaching Strategies.....76

4.1.2 Cognitive.....78

4.1.2.1 Instructional Teaching Strategies.....79
4.1.3 Constructivism……82
4.1.4 Pedagogical Theory of Assessment (Holt and Willard-Holt theory, 2000).....83
4.2 The Pedagogical Styles.....84
4.2.1 David Kolb (Experiential Learning Style and Learning Scale Inventory).....85
4.2.2 Grasha-Riechmann Learning and Teaching Styles (social interaction).....87
4.2.3 Holt and Willard-Holt Assessment Styles (2000).....88
4.2.4 The Architectural Design Studio Culture and Environment Theories.....88
4.3 Conceptual Evaluation of Model Framework.....89

Chapter 5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.0 The research Design.....90
5.1 Sources and Location of Data.....90
5.2 Unit of Analysis and Study Population.....92
5.3 Data Requirement and Characteristics.....93
5.4 Definition and Operational Variables.....94
5.5 Sample Frame.....95
5.5.1 Sampling Technique.....96
5.5.2 Sampling Size.....96
5.6 Data Collection Instrument and Construction.....97
5.6.1 Site Choice Selection Strategies.....97
5.6.2. Questionnaire Administration.....98
5.6.3 Interviews Schedules.....99

5.6.4. Observation Schedules.....100

5.6.5 Students' Profile and Records in Design Studio Courses.....100

5.7 Research Reliability and Validity Tests.....100

5.8 Data Processing and Analysis 101

5.9 Presentation and Data Analysis Methods.....101

5.9.1 Assumptions and Limitations.....102

5.9.2 Contribution to the Body of Knowledge.....103

Chapter Six THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERITICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

6.0 Introduction.....104

6.1 The Respondents across the Four Schools of Architecture.....104

6.1.1: Sex of the Respondents.....104

6.1.2: Age Groupings.....105

6.1.3 Marital Status.....106

6.1.4: Economic Status.....106

6.1.5: Highest Educational Attainment……..…108

6.1.6: The Respondents' Designation and Years of Experience……109

6.2.0: The Socio-economic Characteristics of Student Respondents.....110

6.2.1: Sex of the Respondents.....111

6.2.2 Age Groupings of the Students.....113

6.2.3: Levels of Study and Academic Status in the School.....114

6.2.4: Economic Status of the Respondents as Students.....115

6.2.5: Conclusion.....116

Chapter Seven THE PEDAGOGY OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STUDIO (Section A)

7.0 Introduction……117
7.1 The Personality Characteristics of Students and Staff..... 118.
7.1.1 Students' Orientation to Life.....119

7.1.1.1 Respondents as Students who 'Preferred acting first before Thinking & Reflection'...119

7.1.1.3 Implication for Teaching.....121

7.1.6 Lump Frequency Chart for Students 'Who are usually open and motivated by Outside World'……124

7.1.6.1 Implication for Pedagogical Instruction and Mentoring.....125

7.1.7 Pedagogical Implication and Paradigm Shift.....127

7.1.8: Respondents as Students 'who feel Deprived when cut off from Interaction with the Outside World'……128

7.1.8.1 Implication for Teaching and Learning.....128

7.2.0 Staff Orientation to Life: Extravert (e) versus Introvert (i).....131

7.2.1 Respondents as Staff 'Who Like Acting First before Thinking and Reflection'.....132

7.2.2 Frequency Chart for Staff who '*feel deprived when cut off from interaction*'.....132.

7.2.3 Frequency Chart for Staffs who 'are usually open to and motivated by outside World of people and things'.....133.
7.2.4: Frequency Chart for Staffs who 'enjoy wide variety and change in people relationship'133

7.2.5 Frequency Chart for Staffs who 'prefer outer World of Activities to One-to-One Communications'……134

7.26: Synthesis of 5-Dimensions of Orientation to Life in Architectural Design Studio Pedagogy

7.2.6.1: Pedagogical Predilections and Implications.....135

7.2.7: Establishing the Correlation Factors between the Personalities Characteristics of Respondents as Students and Staffs……136

7.2.8 The Pedagogic Predilections of I-E1 on Architectural Design Studio, Action, Thinking, Reflection and Performance.....137

7.3 Perception of Architectural Design Studio: Sensing and Intuitive-Sensing Personality Characteristics(S).....138

7.3.1 Intuitive Personality Characteristics (iN).....138

7.3.2 Pedagogical Predilections and Implications.....140

7.3.3 Sensing and Intuitive Personality Characteristics: With Respondents as Staff.....142

7.3.4 Respondents as Staff who 'Like Improvising from Past Experience than Theoretical Applications'……..……143

7.3.5 Pedagogic Predilections and Paradigm Shift……144

7.4.0 Perception of Architectural Design Studio: Sensing and Intuitive Personality Characteristics of Students as Respondents……146

7.4.1 Sensing and Intuitive Personality Characteristics: Respondents as Students who 'Mentally Alive Now to present than Future opportunities'……. 147

7.4.1.1 Pedagogical Predilections and Implications.....147

7.4.2 Respondents who 'like using common sense and creating practical solutions rather than Imagining future possibilities……148

7.4.2.1 Pedagogic Implications and Paradigm Shift……..149

Section B REVOLUTIONARY MODELS OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STUDIO PEDAGOGY

7.5.0. Introduction.....155.

7.5.1 The Experimental (Case Based) Model……156

7.5.1.1: The Conception of Architectural Design Studio……156

7.5.1.2 The Design Process……157

7.5.1.3: The Learning and Teaching Styles in Experimental Model.....161

7.5.1.4: The Benefits of the Group Dynamics in Experimental (Case Based Problem) Model. ……161.

7.5.2 The Analogical Model……163

7.5.2.1 The Conception of Architectural Design Studio……163

7.5.2.2: The Design Process……164

7.5.2.3: The Learning and Teaching Styles in Analogical Model.....165.

7.5.3: Aggregates Description of the Ten (10) Pedagogic Models as Practiced by Respondents in the Selected Schools……..…….173

7.5.4: Results and Findings……174

7.5.5: Exploring the Best Pedagogic Practice in 'Participatory' Revolutionary Model……..175

7.5.5.1 Teaching and Learning Styles Paradigm Shift……178

7.5.6 Respondents' Pedagogic Orientation to Design Studio in Covenant University (Experimental Unit 1).....180

7.5.7 Respondents' Pedagogic Orientation to Design Studio in LAUTECH (Experimental Unit 2).....182

7.5.8 Respondents' Pedagogic Orientation to Design Studio in O.A.U and UNILAG (Experimental Unit 3 and4).....183

7.5.9 Summary of Findings on the Ten Revolutionary Pedagogic Models and Practices by Respondents.....186

SectionC THE JURY SYSTEM OF ASSESSMENT IN ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STUDIO

7.6.0 Introduction……187

7.6.1 Holistic Assessment Methods in Architectural Education ……187

7.6.2 Jury Methods as Integral Component of Architectural Design Studio Pedagogy.....187

7.6.3 The Ethics and Conduct of Design Juries…….188.

7.6.4 The Historical Lessons ……189

7.6.5 Need for Redefinition of Jury Practice…….190

7.6.6 The Context of Criticism in Jury assessment Methods…….191

7.6.7 The Major Challenges Facing Jury Assessment Methods in Schools……..…..192

7.6.8 Methodology…….194

7.6.9 The architectural Design Studio Project Brief …….195

7.7.0 Aim and Objectives of the Project……196

7.7.1 The Site…….197

7.7.2 Design Requirements…….……..197

7.7.3 Submission Requirements……197

7.7.4 Results and Discussions……198

7.7.5 Instructor's Observation from the assessment records…….202

7.7.6 Teacher-Students Feedback Outcome…….202

7.7.7 Respondents Understanding of Architectural Design Studio Jury System.....203.

7.7.8 The Component Loadings for Jury Assessment System.....204

7.7.9 The Jury Review and Format.....205

7.8.0 The Jury Purpose, Hierarchy and its Inherent Pedagogies.....208

7.8.0.1. The. Jury's Purpose.....208

7.8.0.2 Jury's Hierarchy.....209

7.8.0.3 The Inherent Pedagogies.....211

7.8.0.4 The Inherent Metaphorical Benefits……212

7.8.0.5 Useful Suggestions for Jury System and Studio Culture Policy.....215

7.8.1 The Jury Objectives and Parameters.....217

7.8.2 The Jury Hindrances and Prospects.....220

7.8.3 Summary and Recommendations.....222

7.8.4: Summary on Jury Assessment System Model in the Four (4) Selected Schools.....225

Chapter Eight: ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STUDIO CULTURE

8.0 Introduction.....226

8.1 The Myths in Architectural Design Studio Culture.....226

8.1.1 Respondents' Perception of Architectural Design Studio Culture Myths.....228

8.1.1.1 The Best Design Ideas only Come in the Middle of the Night.....229

8.1.1.2 Architectural education should require personal and physical sacrifices.....229

8.1.1.3 The Creation of Architecture should be a Solo, Artistic Struggle.....229

8.1.1.4 Creative Energy only comes from the Pressure Deadlines.....229

8.1.1.5 Collaboration with other Students means Giving up the Best Ideas.....230

8.1.1.6 Students should not have a life outside Architecture School.....230

8.1.1.7 The Best Students are those who spend the Most Hours in Studio.....230

8.2 The Demystification of Design Studio Culture.....231

8.3 The Motivation Factors and Architectural Design Studio Environment and Culture Policy.....233

8.4 Incentives as a Student.....235

8.5 Findings and Analysis.....236.

8.6 Interpretations and Implications.....236

8.7 Leadership Responsibility.....237

8.8 Implication on Mentors' Instructional Strategy.....239

Chapter Nine: QUALITY ADEQUACY OF ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STUDIO ENVIRONMENT

9.0 Introduction.....241

9.1 Space Requirement for Architectural Design Studio.....241

9.2: Lighting Requirements for Design Studio: Mean Adequacy for Lighting Requirements in Design Studio (MASL) for the Selected Schools.....244

9.2.1: Lighting performance and Satisfaction of Learning Environment.....247

9.3: Ventilation Requirement for the Quality of Architectural Design Studio Environment…249

9.3.1: Thermodynamics for the Quality of Design Studio Environment and 'Deserted Studio'…….251

9.3.2: Thermal Characteristics and Comfort Level in Architectural Design Studio……252

9.4 Mean Adequacy Score for (MASV) for ventilation of Architectural Design Studio Environment……253

9.5: Safety and Security Requirement for the Quality of Design Studio Environment……..253

9.5.1 Implication on the Respondents Safety and Security in the Design Studio Environment..256

9.5.2 Mean Adequacy Scores for Safety and Security (MASS) and Building Services (MASBs).....259

9.6 General Summary of Interrelationship between Pedagogy, Culture and Environment in Architectural Design Studio.....260

9.7 The Predictors of Pedagogy.....262

Chapter 10: SYNTHESES, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....265

10.0.Introduction.....265

10.1 Overview of Research.....265

10.2: Summary of Key Findings.....268

10.3 Synthesis of Key Issues Arising from the Study.....270

10.4 Implications of Study Findings.....273

10.5 Areas for further Study.....273

10.6 Concluding Remarks.....273

REFERENCES 275

APPENDICES 283

Appendix 1: Table 6.1: The Sex of Staff Respondents' across the Four Schools.....395

Appendix 2: Table 6.2 Age Grouping of Respondents (Staff) across the Four Schools.....395

Appendix 3: Table 6.3: Marital Status of Staff across the Four Schools.....395

Appendix 4 : Table 6.4: Average Monthly Income for the Respondents across the Four Schools.....395

Appendix5: Table 6.5: Highest Levels of Education Attainment of the Respondents across the Four Schools.....396

Appendix 6: Table 6.6: The Respondents' Designation across the Four Schools.....396

Appendix7:Table6.7: Respondents' Years of Experience as Teacher in the Four Selected Schools.....396

Appendix 8: Table 6.8: Sex of the Respondents (Students).....396

Appendix 9: Table 6.9: Age Distribution of Student across the Four Schools.....397

Appendix 10: Table 6.9.1: The Respondents Levels of Study.....397

Appendix 11: Table 6.9.2: Monthly Pocket Money Received by the Respondents.....397

Appendix 12: Table 7.1 Case Based (Experimental) Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....398

Appendix 13: Table 7.2 Analogical Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....398

Appendix 14: Table 7.3: Participatory Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....398

Appendix 15: Table 7.4 Hidden Curriculum Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....399

Appendix 16: Table 7.5 Pattern Language Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....399
Appendix 17: Table 7.6 Concept-Test Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....399
Appendix 18: Table 7.7 Double Layer Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....400
Appendix 19: Table 7.8 Energy Consumer Model Preferences across the Selected Schools.....400
Appendix 20: Table 7.9 Cross tabulation for Exploratory Model–Students Preferences.....400
Appendix 21: Table 7.10 Cross tabulation for Interactional Model–Students Preferences.....401
Appendix 22: Table 7.2.1 Cross Tabulation for the Case Problem (Experimental) Model.....401
Appendix 23: Table 7.2.2: Cross tabulation for Analogical Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....401
Appendix 24: Table 7.2.3: Cross tabulation for Participatory Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....402
Appendix 25: Table7.2.4: Cross tabulation for Hidden Curriculum Model-Staff Preferences across the Schools.....402
Appendix 26: Table7.2.5: Cross tabulation for Pattern Language Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....402
Appendix 27: Table7.2.6: Cross tabulation for Concept-Test Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....403
Appendix 28: Table7.2.7: Cross tabulation for Double Layer Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....403
Appendix 29: Table7.2.8: Cross Tabulation for Energy Consumer Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....403
Appendix 30: Table7.2.9: Cross tabulation for Exploratory Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....404
Appendix 31: Table7.3.0: Cross tabulation for Interactional Model–Staff Preferences across the Schools.....404
Appendix 32: Table7.7.5 Sample of Project assessment data collection sheet: Royal Academy of Architecture.....404
Appendix 33: Table 7.7.6: A Sample of Project assessment data collection sheet for*ARC321 Architectural Design Studio IV*, 2010/2011 Session.....405
Appendix 34: Table 7.7.7: Component Loadings for Jury Assessment System in the Four (4) Selected Schools.....407
Appendix 35: Table 7.7.7.1 Model Summary for Jury Assessment System.....408
Appendix 36: Table 7.7.8 The Jury Review and Format in the four (4) Selected Schools in South-West Nigeria.....408
Appendix 37: Table 7.7.8.1: Respondents who agreed that 'Jury elicits useful advice from critics'.....408
Appendix 38: Table 8.7: Factor Variables and Loading for Design Studio Culture.....409
Appendix 39: Student Questionnaire *CU/DSR/PCE10/QN0*----1- Evaluation of Architectural Design Studio Programmes in Selected Schools of Architecture in Nigeria.....410
Appendix 40: Staff *CU/DSR/PCE10/QN0* 2; Evaluation of Architectural Design Studio Programmes in Selected schools of architecture in Nigeria.....419

LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

Plate 2.1 Showing the Ultramodern Design Studio (MSc.) School of Architecture, Covenant University during a Jury Session.....29
Plate 2.2 Showing Jury Systems as a Forum for Learning Architectural Design Studio.....30
Plate 2.3: Showing Design Studio Spaces for Pin Ups in Covenant University, Ota.....30
Plate 2.4: The 300 Level Studio, School of Architecture, LAUTECH, Ogbomoso, Oyo State..31
Plate 2.5: Showing Studio Setting and Lighting Systems
(200 Level Studio O.A.U, Ile-Ife) 32
Plate 2.6 Showing the Organization of UNILAG 200 level Design Studio Environment.....33
Plate3.1: Symbiosis between Teaching and Research: Reinforcing the Centrality of Architectural Design Studio.....48
Plate 4.1: Bloom's Taxonomy: Cognitive Domain.....85
Plate 4.2: David Kolb's Experiential Learning Style.....90
Plate 7.8.2 Showing Intelligent Display of Pragmatism and Dialogue between Jurors and Design Students.....
Plate 7.8.3; Showing an M.Sc. Female Design Student Communicating Her Design Intents to the Jurors.....

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 6.1 Average Monthly Incomes of the Respondents in Naira.....112
Figure 6.2: Highest Level of Educational Attainment of the Respondents (Teachers).....113
Figure 6.3: Sex Distributions of Respondents (students) across the Selected Schools.....117
Figure 6.4 Age Distribution of Student across the Four (4) Selected Schools.....119
Figure 7.2.1 Bar Chart for Staff who 'feel deprived when cut off from interaction'.....140
Figure 7.2.2 Showing Correlation Factors between the Personalities Characteristics of Respondents as Students and Staffs.....146
Figure7.3.0 Respondents as Teachers who are '*Mentally Alive Now to Present than Future Opportunities'*.....149
Figure 7.3.1 Respondents who 'like Using Common Sense and Practical Solutions than Imaginations'.....151
Figure 7.3.2 My Memory Recall is Rich detail of facts of past events than Ordinary Patterns Connections.....153
Figure 7.3.3 Showing Respondents who like Improvising from Past Experience than Theoretical Applications.....154
Figure 7.3.4: Showing the 7-Dimensions of Intuitive –Sensing Personalities Characteristics of Respondents in Four Selected Schools.....163
Figure 7.3.5: Showing Intuitive-Sensing Personality Characteristics across the Four (4) Selected Schools.....164
Figure 7.3.5.1: Showing Average Personality Characteristics of both Respondents (Students and Staffs).....165
Figure7.5: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Case Based Experimental Model.....170
Figure 7.5.3: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Analogical Model 176

Figure 7.5.4: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Participatory Model 177
Figure7.5.5: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Hidden Curriculum Model.....178
Figure7.5.6: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Pattern Language Model.....179
Figure7.5.7: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Concept-Test Model.....180
Figure7.5.8: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Double Layer Model.....181
Figure7.5.9: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Energy Consumer Model.....182
Figure7.6.0: Showing the Respondents' Significant Indices for Exploratory Model.....183
Figure 9.1: Showing the Space Requirement Quality for Architectural Design Studio Environment.....259
Figure 9.2: Showing Lighting Requirement for the Quality of Design Studio Environment.....262
Figure 9.2.1:Showing Integration of Natural Lighting into the Design Studio Spaces.....263
Figure 9.3.1: Showing Ventilation Requirements for the Quality of Design Studio Environment.....267
Figure 9.3.2: Thermodynamics for the Quality of Design Studio Environment.....268
Figure 9.5: Showing the significant indices for UNILAG, O.A.U, CU and LAUTECH.....271
Figure 9.5.1: Showing Safety and Security Requirement for the Quality of Design Studio.....272
Figure 9.6 Showing Privacy Requirements for Architectural Design Studio Learning Environment 273

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The University Schools of Architecture in Nigeria.....9
Table 2.1: Demographics and Socio-economic Characteristics of Selected Schools.....10
Table3.1: Learning Environment Scales and Characteristics.....76
Table 4.1: Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.....85
Table 4.2: Grasha-Riechmann Learning Styles.....91
Table 4.3: Grasha-Riechmann Teaching Styles.....92
Table 5.1: List of University Schools of Architecture in Nigeria.....98
Table 6.1: The Sex of Teachers' Respondents' across the Four Schools.....110
Table 6.2 Age Grouping of Respondents (Teachers) across the Four Schools.....111
Table 6.3: Marital Status of Teachers across the Four Selected Schools.....111
Table 6.4: Average Monthly Income for the Respondents Teachers across the Four Selected Schools.....113

Table 6.5: Highest Levels of Education Attainment of the Respondents across the Four Schools.....114
Table 6.6: The Respondents' Designation across the Four Schools.....115
Table 6.7: Respondents' Years of Experience as Teachers in the Four Selected Schools.....116
Table 6.8: Sex of the Respondents (Students).....118
Table 6.9: Age Distribution of Student across the Four Schools.....119
Table 6.9.1: The Respondents Levels of Study.....120
Table 6.9.2: Monthly Pocket Money Received by the Respondents.....121

Table 7.1.2 Tabulation for Respondents as students 'who Like acting first before thinking and Reflection'……126

Table 7.1.2.1: Cross Tabulation for Respondents as students and Staff '*who Like acting first Before Thinking and Reflection'*…….126

Table 8.6 Component Loadings for Architectural Design Studio Culture.....247

Table 8.7 Motivational Factors, Design Environment and Studio Culture Policies.....249

Table 8.7.1 Availability of Funds and Other Incentives for Respondents.....250
Table 8.8 Studio Culture Ethics and Code of Conduct.....251
Table 8.8.1:Leadership Responsibility.....254
Table 8.9.1 Number of Days for Studio Attendance.....254
Table 8.9.2 Consultation with Mentors.....255
Table 8.9.3 Number of Hours for Consultation with Mentors.....256

Table 9.1.1: Cross Tabulation of General Spaces in design studio across the Four (4) Selected Schools.....259
Table 9.1.2: Synthesis: Space Requirement Quality of Architectural Design Studio Environment.....260
Table 9.1.3 Mean Adequacy Scores for Design Studio Space (MASDS) for the Selected Schools.....261
9.2.1: Synthesis: Lighting Requirement for the Quality of Architectural Design Studio Environment.....260
9.2.2 Mean Adequacy Scores for Lighting in Architectural Design Studio (MASL) across the four Selected Schools.....265
Table 9.3.1 Synthesis: Ventilation Requirement for the Quality of Architectural Design Studio Environment.....266
Table 9.4.1 Ventilation Requirement for Architectural Design Studio Environment: Mean Score for Ventilation Requirement (MASV).....270
Table 9.5.1: Safety and Security Requirement for the Quality of Design Studio Environment.....271
Table 9.5.2: Safety and Security Requirements: Mean Adequacy Scores for Safety and SecurityRequirements in four (4) Selected Architectural Design Studio.....272

Table 9.6: Nexus of Mean Adequacy Scores for Ventilation, Safety and Security, and Privacy Requirements for the Four (4) Selected Architectural Design Studio Learning Environment.....274
Table: 9.7 Mean Adequacy scores for Privacy Requirements (MASP) for the Four (4) Selected Architectural Design Studio Environment.....274
Table 9.7.1 Descriptive Statistics Mean Adequacy Scores for Safety and Security (MASS) and Building Services (MASBs).....276
Table 9.8 Mean Adequacy Score for Auxiliary Facilities (MAAF).....276
Table 9.9 The Factor Analysis for Pedagogy, Culture and Environment.....278
Table 9.9.1 The Factor Analysis for Design Studio Culture and Guidelines for Policy Making..280