

Assessment of Styles of Teaching Building Structures in Architecture in Southwestern Nigerian Public Universities

¹Oyadokun J. O., ¹Odunjo O. O. and ²Akindele O. A.

1. Department of Architecture
2. Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo state.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2013/vol11n126173>

Published September 30 2023

Citation: Oyadokun J. O., Odunjo O. O. and Akindele O. A. (2023) Assessment of Styles of Teaching Building Structures in Architecture in Southwestern Nigerian Public Universities, *British Journal of Education*, Vol.11, Issue 12, 61-73

ABSTRACT: *There are several teaching styles in the literature that have been traditionally used in the teaching of Building structures to students of Architecture. Nevertheless, they have all been streamlined into two styles: didactic and interactive styles of teaching and upon these that the assessment of this study was based. This study assessed styles of teaching Building structure courses to Architecture students in Southwestern Nigerian public Universities, with a view to improving the performance of the students in these courses. Quantitative research approach was adopted and employed descriptive survey. The principal survey techniques used was questionnaire. Five public universities approved by the National Universities Commission and Architects Registration Council of Nigeria were purposively sampled. A total of 702 questionnaires were administered to all the pre-final and final year students in the Department of Architecture of the sampled universities, while only 541 questionnaires were adequately completed and considered fit for analysis. Cross tabulation with chi-square was used to summarize the data. The study revealed that the teachers were using both didactic and interactive teaching styles. The conclusion here was that the teachers were not using interactive teaching styles fully in teaching the courses to students which led to poor performance of students in the courses. Therefore, the study recommended that strong priority should be given to the quality of teaching by using interactive teaching style only in the teaching of Building structures.*

KEYWORDS: teaching, styles, structures, universities

INTRODUCTION

Building structure is a required course and one of the compulsory courses the students in the study of Architecture (Adetunji, 2014, Opoko, Alagbe, Aderonmu, Ezema, & Oluwatayo, 2014). The understanding of this course is very important and vital to the success of Architecture students. However, a cursory observation at the performance of Architecture students in Building Structure suggests that there are problems, according to Opoko *et al.* (2014) because the course seems to be the most difficult course for Architecture students who

mostly believe that the course is not student friendly; and this is of a major concern to the Building Structure teachers.

There is nothing more frustrating than spending several weeks on a topic only to give an assessment and discover that many students have made little or no gain in their knowledge about the topic (Laurie, 2012). This seemingly lack of interest of students in Building Structure mostly in the area of theories (calculations) and application of knowledge may be evidence that there are problems in the teaching of the courses probably due to teaching styles adopted by the lecturers' in charge. Problem of Architecture students in Building Structure is not limited to universities in Nigeria alone but also to all schools of Architecture worldwide (Aniza, Maha, & Lim, 2010).

However, the impartation of the knowledge of Building Structure into students is essential and germane to the production of competent, skilled and versatile Architects that are capable of understanding the need for functional and stable buildings to house the teeming population of Nigeria (Afolami, Olotuah, Fakere & Omale, 2013). Therefore, this study assessed the teaching styles adopted by lectures in Building structures in Southwestern Nigerian universities. This is with a view to recommending suggestions that will improve the performance of students in the courses

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teaching Styles in Building structures

The teaching of variation of forces and moments in a structural member is a critical component of Building Structure, which most Architecture students find difficult. At times, students view structure courses as marginal and abstract in the overall curriculum (Vassigh, 2002; Sineed and Narama, 2012). Many authors such as Vassigh (2005) and Aniza *et al.*, (2010) stated that the problems in teaching Building Structure to Architecture students could be broadly categorised into six types namely: the students' problem, the teachers' problem, the teaching methods problem, the instructional tools problem, curriculum problem and classroom environment problem.

(i). ***The students' problem***: Many Architecture students have little knowledge background and disposition to master the mathematics skills required or needed in Building Structure. As a result, they become uninterested and frustrated by the Structure courses. Many failed to master the basic applied structural designs because of little knowledge of statics and applied Physics that the courses involve. Majority of Architecture students consider Structure courses to be difficult, complicated and sometimes, not relevant because it involves a lot of calculations thereby finding the courses difficult to progress from abstract principles to their applications. These led to the loss of enthusiasm and interest accompanying the learning of Structure and without enthusiasm, true knowledge is impossible.

Instructions in Building Structure are quantitative and to communicate basic concepts, require high – level mathematics nomenclature, these are problematic in the case of Architecture students. The applied – engineering approach of teaching structure uses an abstractionist and

reductionist methodology that develop a quantitative explanation for all physical events (Shahin, 2002). It therefore fails to address structural issues as an innovative and creative activity in a design project. Instead of structural considerations to be a set of interesting challenges, it becomes a burden that the students must bear in order to get functional project. At times, students understand many ideas, but may be confused in the application because fundamental structural ideas are not properly understood which affected their creativity of Architectural designs. Many of them lack confidence to cope with the structural problems in their Architectural designs and fail to link the Building structure and Architectural designs together because of lack of application of structural knowledge gained from Building Structure (Vassigh, 2005; Aniza *et al.*, 2010).

Most of them exclude issues of Structure within the Architectural designs context, the central importance of Structure and structural behavior as design elements are overlooked. Poor attendance of classes, distractions and financial stresses are problems of Architecture students which affects their performances in Building Structure. Some students enter classes with an altitude of “Why should I care?” and forget that the proper understanding of Structure is fundamental to the success of Architects who lead a team of Engineers.

There is also scarcity of relevant textbooks and academic learning materials and the available ones are unaffordable for some of the Architecture students who are faced with the expensive Architectural designs materials. With the fast development of computers and internets, students have lost the ability to read textbooks or even to write notes, but only to type or photocopy. Many depend on the notes given by the teachers and that is why the Universal Basic (UB) report (2005) states that nation’s universities are producing graduates who are technically unprepared for the professional practices.

(ii). *The teachers’ problem:* Teaching Building Structure to Architecture students is also complex because of their background, mentality and attitudes toward the courses. Students of Architecture are required to know about Building structures and the design of these structures, but lack of interest and little knowledge in statics give the teachers of Building Structure problems and concerns on how to put the courses across to them. The problem of every teacher who teaches Building Structure is how to explain structural theories and concepts to Architecture students who see Architectural designs more meaningful and relevant than Building Structure.

Lack of information, supports and tools necessary to fully integrate teaching of Building Structure to Architecture students make the teaching extremely difficult for teachers and also, lack of further educational trainings in term of conferences, seminars and workshops in order to keep abreast of all the current developments worldwide. Lack of integration of structural knowledge in students’ Architectural designs coupled with unconcerned attitudes of the students give the teachers’ serious problems in the teaching of Building Structure.

(iii). *The teaching methods problem:* The methods of teaching Building Structure to Architecture students within academic programs face a fundamental problem in the delivery systems because the Architecture students struggle with a traditional engineering – based

approach to structure teaching which is increasingly unsuitable to Architecture students (Hyett, 2000; Aziza *et al.*, 2010). The teaching methods involve the teachers of Building Structure explains the subject matter thoroughly with little or no students interaction. The efficiency of the teaching is also reduced due to the short span of teaching and students lose focus and interest for the facts that the courses involve calculations; therefore, the teaching methods are distinctly inappropriate for the vast majority of Architecture students.

(iv). *The instructional tools problem:* The instructional tools for teaching Building Structure are also borrowed from Civil engineering and did not satisfy the Architecture students' need. Architecture students are aware that structural systems affect the aesthetics part of design, but lack of basic qualitative understanding of Building Structure affects their designs. They struggle with the engineering – based approach for structure instructions which have increasingly proved ineffective in the classroom. Most of the existing teaching materials are either geared towards the descriptive and qualitative methods which are insufficient for the architectural needs or remain highly qualitative and difficult to comprehend for the majority of Architecture students. Structure instructions are rarely, if ever fully integrated into the border of Architecture curriculum (Vassigh, 2002) and the integration of Building Structure into building designs plays an active push for the quality of Architects produce. (Liu – Yan, 2014).

(v). *Curriculum problem:* Vassigh (2005) noted that the curriculum contents and concepts are borrowed in a wholesale manner from engineering programs with little modification. This makes Architecture students to be frustrated, uninterested and even intimidated by the structure curriculum. Unfortunately, Building Structure programs are derivatives of traditional teaching methods and conception that originated in Civil engineering schools; as such, they are not conceived, developed or taught as programs aimed at Architecture students' needs (Shahim, 2002).Lack of co – ordinate curriculum between the Structure courses and Architectural designs is also a problem for the teaching and learning of Building Structure in Architecture and this has reduced the level of development of the intuition of Architecture students. The course contents are good, but the contents to be covered are too many within the stipulated periods coupled with various obstacles, such as strikes which reduced the workable periods in a year (Aziza *et al.*, 2010).

(vi). *Classroom environment problem:* Quality of classroom environment significantly affects students' achievement, that is, the classrooms in which students spend a good deal of their time learning, influence how well they learn (Earthman, 2004). Better classroom environment improves the attitudes of learning and teaching (Higgins *et al.*, 2005). Majority of classrooms where Architecture students are learning lack infrastructure, facilities and adequate spaces

TEACHING STYLES AND TRADITIONAL METHODS

Teaching styles

Teaching style is defined as all the decisions made during the teaching and learning process (Heaton, 1983). Teachers are usually selective in using a plethora of teaching styles

(Chatterjee and Ramesh, 2015). Teaching styles are developed based on beliefs about what constitutes good teaching, personal preferences, abilities and the norms of the particular discipline (Watson, 2003). Strategies are resorted to, which are in line with learning style. Scholars of learning style model postulate that students learn in different ways (Coffield, Moseley, Hall & Ecclestone, 2004), they are unique in their own ways including learning. As the students have different learning styles, so it is the responsibility of the teachers to explore the teaching style index that will facilitate the students to get exposure of different learning activities to adopt a wider field of student learning styles in order to achieve more effective learning (Hawk and Shahi, 2007).

Curtin (2005) studied a group of learners and their teachers and categorised teaching styles as didactic and interactive. Didactic teachers make most of the decisions in the classroom; emphasise teaching the content and put students in a passive role. On the other hand, interactive teachers allow for the diverse learning styles of their students, place much emphasis on the teaching and learning process and expect students to be active learners. Curtin (2005) in his finding suggested that teachers who adopt an interactive teaching style can better meet the unique needs of the students.

Chang (2002) explored views of students who were instructed with a constructivist approach and a traditional approach. He concluded that students placed more value on having the opportunity to actively participate in group discussions and examine concepts they learned when they were taught through the constructivist approach rather than the traditional approach. The study suggested that the constructivist teaching style foster greater flexibility in teaching and brings about students' use of deep learning strategies and knowledge construction. In contrast to Chang's study, Kim (2005) indicated that students who received a constructivist teaching style had greater use of learning strategies than those who received a traditional teaching style. He further stated that there was no significant difference between learning strategies by the two groups.

There are several teaching styles in the literature that have been traditionally used. Nevertheless, they have all been streamlined into two styles: didactic and interactive and it is upon these that the analysis of this study was based. It may be argued that interactive teaching style is gravitation from the didactic teaching style which has been the orthodox pedagogical lifeblood in teaching arenas. Didactic method is teacher-centered. Students taught under this method take knowledge hook-line and sinker from the teacher and often times, need to memorise the cogent points in the teaching with little or no interpretation. It is the pedagogy of instructions and immutable facts of authority handed down from the principal to the subordinates; from the blackboard to the learners, carefully arranged in the columns and rows of chairs and desks.

Didactic method of teaching provides students with the required theoretical knowledge. It is an effective method used to teach students who are unable to organise their works and depend on teachers for instructions. It focuses on the baseline knowledge students possess and seek to improve upon. It is used to teach basic skills of reading and writing. Meanwhile, interactive method of teaching is a means of instruction whereby teachers actively involve the

students in learning process by way of regular teacher-student interaction; use of audio-visuals and hand-on demonstrations. Here, students are encouraged to be active participants.

Traditional Methods of Teaching Structure

Apart from the general methods of teaching which are also applicable to the teaching of Building Structures, the traditional methods used in teaching Building Structures include:

(i) **Lecture method:** Sajjad (2010) reiterated that the lecture method of teaching is a talk or verbal presentation delivered by teacher, lecturer or speaker to teach students. This method is widely used in teaching Building Structure. Osakinle, Onijingin & Falana (2010) describe this method of teaching as one that is suitable for pre – university level of education while Olotuah and Adeniji (2005) stated that the method involves teacher – students’ interactions.

(ii) **Assignment method:** Teachers use this method to check the level of understanding of students and how well the students understand a particular topic. According to Afolami *et al* (2014), assignment is given to students at strategic times within the period of learning to determine students’ level of understanding since the students are not expected to submit the answers immediately. This gives the students opportunity to be actively involved in learning while in their respective residences.

(iii) **Test quiz method:** This method is similar to assignment method. The students are given limited time to proffer solutions to questions given by the teacher. This method is best to determine the instantaneous understanding the students have derived from the topic taught.

(iv) **Case study method:** This method is a powerful student – centered approach capable of imparting students with critical thinking, communication and interpersonal skills. The students are allowed to work through complex, ambiguous and real world problems. Acquaint them with course materials, encourage them from an action perspective rather than analyse it from a distance (Schwartz, 2012). This method is multi-disciplinary and allows the application of theoretical concepts taught in class; it therefore bridges the gap between theory and practice. Eigbeonan (2013) stated that case study method increase students’ proficiency with written and oral communication as well as collaboration and team work.

(v) **Discussion method:** Sajjad (2010) defined this method as a free verbal exchange of ideas between group members or teacher and students. For effective discussion, the students have a prior knowledge and information about the topic to be discussed. Adetunji (2014) stated that one of the strengths of this method is encouragement of various ideas and experiences from group and it allows everyone to participate actively in the topic under discussion.

(vi) **Practical example method:** In this method, students ask for more industrial and practical examples in the teaching of Building structure. This helped to connect structural theory with practical examples in the classroom and in learning. The use of practical examples in the classroom is targeted to help illustrate and explain new concepts introduced and to teach the students how to apply them. The examples are clear and straight forward and as simple as possible. It is designed in a way that the students’ senses are brought to play.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The study employed descriptive survey. It focused on five public universities (accredited universities by NUC and ARCON) in Southwestern Nigeria where Architecture is offered namely: Federal University of Technology, Akure (FUTA); Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Ile – Ife, Osun State; University of Lagos (UNILAG), Lagos; Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU), Ago – Iwoye, Ogun State and Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH), Ogbomoso, Oyo State.

These five universities were sampled out of the twenty approved public universities schools of Architecture in Nigeria and they are from Southwestern Nigeria representing 20% of total approved schools of Architecture in Nigeria and 100% of total approved in Southwestern Nigeria by National Universities Commission (NUC) and Architects Registration Council of Nigeria (ARCON).

The study focused on data obtained from Architecture students of all the five public universities. The research approach adopted for this study was quantitative approach. The principal survey techniques used was questionnaire. Data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data was numeric and was first hand information which constituted the bulk of the data used for the study.

The population for the study was seven hundred and two (702) students, that is, one hundred and two (102) students from LAUTECH, eighty-nine (89) students from OOU, two hundred and forty-five (245) students from FUTA, one hundred and seventeen (117) students from OAU and two hundred and forty-five (245) students from UNILAG and shown below,

Table 1: Population of the Study

S/N	Name of University	Duration	Level	Number of students sampled	Total number of students sampled
1	Federal University of Technology, Akure (FUTA)	5yrs	400 500	125 120	245
2	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH), Ogbomoso.	5 yrs	400 500	47 55	102
3	Obafemi Awolowo University (O.A.U), Ile Ife.	4yrs	300 400	62 55	117
4	University of Lagos (UNILAG), Lagos.	4yrs	300 400	72 77	149
5	Olabisi Onabanjo University (O.O.U), Ago - Iwoye.	5yrs	300 400	45 44	89
	Total				702

Source: Authors' Compilation, 2021

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

However, the total feedback was five hundred and forty one (541) representing 77.1% which is considered valid for assessing the situation under study (Table 2).

Table 2: Questionnaire Distributed and Retrieved

S/N	Name of University	Duration	Level	Questionnaire Distributed	Questionnaire Received	Total Distributed	Total Received
1	Federal University of Technology, Akure (FUTA)	5yrs	400 500	125 120	80 92	245	172
2	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH), Ogbomoso.	5 yrs	400 500	47 55	45 55	102	100
3	Obafemi Awolowo University (O.A.U), Ile Ife.	4yrs	300 400	62 55	45 50	117	95
4	University of Lagos (UNILAG), Lagos.	4yrs	300 400	72 77	52 50	149	102
5	Olabisi Onabanjo University (O.O.U), Ago - Iwoye.	5yrs	300 400	45 44	33 39	89	72
Total						702	541

Source: Authors' Compilation, 2021

Data collected were analysed based on the information obtained from completed questionnaire. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, Likert scaling and Chi-square.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Telling the difference between didactic and interactive teaching for every Building Structure classes by the respondents (students) is somewhat difficult. Most of the students do not know what the methods means or how it impacts their learning. To be able to make sense out of the research, variables that are pertinent to describing the attributes of either of the didactic or interactive methods of teaching were compiled. These variables include: perception of Structure teachers doing all the talking in class, providing all knowledge, giving expertise answers to all questions, discouragement of students participation, new ideas, questioning and answering in classes. Others are: giving of notes and handout, finishing lecture in time, ensure understanding of a topic before starting another, testing of previous knowledge, use of audio-visual aids, examination duration, teaching with gesture, allowance for questions and adequacy of homework and assignments. These were used to scale the method of teaching at the sampled universities.

Scaled Teaching Outcome in the Selected Universities

In order to make the analysis a bit more comprehensible and for the possibility of summative indexing for further parametric analysis, the study went further to scale the ordinal data into

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

interval form, using a method reminiscent of Likert scaling. Basically, this involves attachment of weights or points to the ordinal ratings of the respondents. In the study, 'strongly agree' attracts four points, 'agree' attracts three points, 'neutral' attracts two, 'disagree' attracts one while 'strongly disagree' attracts zero. These points were used to multiply the corresponding frequency of rating to produce a weight value for the variable as distributed among the sampled universities. Addition of these weights for each sampled university is the sum of weight which is presented in the study. By this, it is possible to measure each ordinal variable more decisively and produce a more summarised data on each variable of measurement for each of the university. In the study, the measurement fifteen variables led to the opinion formed on the teaching outcome of Building Structure courses in Architecture. Glancing through the scaled data, it would be observed that different universities exuded different levels of strength as shown below:

Table 3: Scaled Teaching Outcome in the Selected Universities

S/N	Variables	OOU	LAUTECH	UNILAG	FUTA	OAU	X ²
1	Structure teachers do all talking and students listen in class	158	211	312	408	267	0.000
2	Structure teachers explain all points and provide all knowledge	210	302	285	410	269	0.000
3	Structure teachers give expertise answers to all questions asked	225	264	317	429	265	0.000
4	Structure teachers discourage students' participation in class	90	130	225	227	113	0.000
5	Structure teachers discourage new ideas	79	130	207	252	173	0.000
6	Structure teachers ask lot of questions and expect answers	209	295	323	471	283	0.003
7	Structure teachers teach by giving note or handout only	73	85	213	206	114	0.000
8	Structure teachers do not finish lectures on time	143	137	271	281	209	0.000
9	Structure teachers ensure the understanding of a topic before proceeding to next one.	210	262	290	408	230	0.001
10	Structure teachers don't ask previous knowledge before proceeding to new	115	132	240	302	157	0.000
11	Structure teachers use audio-visual aids	124	91	210	220	156	0.000
12	Structure teachers give sufficient time for tests	186	212	258	334	226	0.001
13	Structure teachers teach with gestures and save time	174	246	286	409	199	0.001
14	Structure teachers allow questions during and after class	220	316	335	496	253	0.000
15	Structure teachers don't give assignment/ homework	98	68	198	140	140	0.001
Total		2314	2881	3970	4993	3054	

Source: Authors' Computation, 2021

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

In all, FUTA (4993) was observed to be doing better in the area of teaching outcomes judged by the rating of the students (Table 3). This was followed by UNILAG (3970); OAU (3054); LAUTECH (2881) and OOU (2314). The study is not ranking the universities because of total number of students in each university which varies but to see at a glance, the teaching outcome in the courses. It is a fact that all the universities need to improve in all the sampled universities and put in more efforts to achieve a better teaching outcome for students especially in Building Structure courses.

Table 4: Summary of Teaching Style

S/N	Variables	Disagree (%)	Indifferent (%)	Agree (%)	Teaching Style used
1	Teachers do all talking and students listen in class	18.2	24.8	57.0	Didactic
2	Structure teachers explain all points and provide all knowledge	10.7	19.5	69.8	Didactic
3	Structure teachers give expertise answers to all questions asked	11.8	11.6	76.5	Didactic
4	Structure teachers discourage students' participation in class	55.4	23.5	21.1	Interactive
5	Structure teachers discourage new ideas	50.3	24.2	25.5	Interactive
6	Structure teachers ask lot of questions and expect answers	6.8	17.5	75.7	Interactive
7	Structure teachers teach by giving note or handout only	60.9	19.6	19.5	Interactive
8	Structure teachers do not finish lectures on time	36.7	25.0	38.3	Didactic
9	Structure teachers ensure the understanding of a topic before starting another one.	19.3	16.2	64.5	Interactive
10	Structure teachers don't ask previous knowledge before proceeding to new	43.1	26.1	30.8	Didactic
11	Structure teachers use audio-visual aids	51.6	23.2	25.2	Interactive
12	Structure teachers give sufficient time for tests	26.6	18.8	54.6	Interactive
13	Structure teachers teach with gestures and save time	18.4	20.5	61.1	Interactive
14	Structure teachers allow questions during and after class	10.3	6.0	83.7	Interactive
15	Structure teachers don't give assignment/ homework	64.9	14.0	21.1	Interactive

Source: Authors' Computation, 2021

From Table 4, teachers do all the talking, while the students listen in class. More (57.0%) agreed while few (18.2%) of the students disagreed to it. This method of teaching is didactic. The study went further to rate the teachers on whether teachers provide all knowledge and explain all points in class without students' contribution. Majority (69.8%) agreed and few (10.7%) of the students disagreed that teachers provide all the knowledge and this is confirmation of didactic teaching. Giving expertise answers to all questions is a sign of

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

teachers' competency and brilliancy, but it reduces students' participation in class. In the same manner, a greater proportion (76.5%) of students was in affirmative to this assertion and few (11.8%) disagreed. This is also didactic method of teaching.

Discouragement of class participation in class by the teachers was also investigated since teacher used didactic method of teaching. It was observed to be generally poor in all sampled universities. Few (21.1%) of the students agreed to this. It was also investigated if teachers discourage new ideas from students and it was observed that teachers do not encourage new ideas. This is interactive method of teaching. Averagely, 50.3% of the students agreed that teachers do not encourage new ideas.

The study went further to investigate questioning and answering in class. Majority (75.7%) of the students responded in affirmative that there was high incidence of question and answer exchange between teachers and students. This is interactive teaching and it was relatively high in all sampled schools. Furthermore, students were asked to rate if teaching depends on notes or handouts alone. Most (60.9%) of the students regardless of school; disagreed that giving of handouts and notes were not the major or only things done by teachers. This is interactive style.

A complete and adequate use of time in the classroom was investigated. The proportion of the respondents who 'agreed' that the teachers do not finish teaching on time was slightly higher (38.3%) than those who believed in the contrary (36.7%). Overall, teachers spend lengthy time at teaching. The study went further to investigate the modular prioritisation and sequential teaching in classes. Again, most (64.5%) students 'agreed' that teachers treated every topic very well before proceeding to a new one. This information was true for all the sampled universities.

One of the ways to ensure that the last topic treated was well assimilated by the students is to test previous knowledge. In the study, more (43.1%) of the students responded in the affirmative that teachers always test previous knowledge before proceeding to the next topic whereas, few (30.8%) disagreed. The use of audio-visual aids in classes by the teachers was also investigated. Many (51.6%) of the students 'disagreed' with only (25.2%) giving impressions that audio-visual aids were used in classes. Sufficiency of examination time was rated by students. Many (54.6%) of the respondents 'agreed' that teachers usually give sufficient time during tests or examinations while few (26.6%) of the students disagreed.

Furthermore, teachers were rated by students on ability to use gestures or act in class in accordance with interactive teaching style. It was observed that many (61.1%) of the students 'agreed' that teachers teach with this attribute and few (18.4%) disagreed. Allowance for questions during and after the class depicts class participation and is symptomatic of interactive teaching and this attribute was also investigated. Majority (83.7%) of the students 'agreed' with affirmation that teachers allowed questions and answers during and after the class and few (10.3%) disagreed. Next to this is of giving of homework and assignments. Many (63.9%) of the students indicated satisfaction at the rate at which these were given by the teachers and few (21.1%) disagreed.

CONCLUSION

The study has assessed styles of teaching Building structures in Southwestern Nigerian public universities. It has shown the various teaching styles adopted by the teachers. The study concludes that the teachers in charge of the courses. The study concludes that the teachers were not using interactive style of teaching fully which led to poor performance of students in the courses.

The study therefore recommends that teachers should imbibe interactive style in the teaching of the courses so as to aid students understanding.

REFERENCES

- Adetunji, O.S. (2014). Student – Centered Methods of Teaching Architecture Students Theory of Structures in Nigeria Universities. *International Journal of Education and Research*, **2**(10): 437 – 444.
- Akinsolu, A.O. (2010). Teachers and Students’ Academic Performance in Nigerian Secondary Schools: Implications for Planning. *Florida Journal of Education Administration and Policy*, **3**(2): 86-103.
- Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*, Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Different Teaching Methods, Types of Teaching Method, Effective Teaching Method. [passnownow.com/classroom – support/teaching – methods](http://passnownow.com/classroom-support/teaching-methods). 2015.06.028
- Effective teaching - The new method for effective teaching by Pow Toon! [www.powtoon.com/blog/effective- teaching](http://www.powtoon.com/blog/effective-teaching). 2015.05.024
- Evolution of teaching methods. www.google.com.ng/search?site=&source=hp&ei=D52V. 2015.06.008
- Felder, R.M and Silverman, L.K (1988). Learning and teaching styles. *Engineering Education*, **78**(7): 674 – 681.
- Felder, R.M. (1996). Matters of Style. *ASEE Prism*, **6**(4): 18 - 23.
- Grasha, A.F. (1996). Teaching with Style: A Practical Guide to Enhancing Learning by Understanding Teaching and Learning Styles. *College Teaching*, **48**: 1 – 12.
- Grasha, A.F. and Hicks, N.Y. (2000). Integrating teaching styles and learning style with instructional teaching. *College Teaching*, **48**(1): 2- 15.
- Kochkar, S.K. (2000). *Methods and Techniques of Teaching*. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Lindermann, J., Sandberg, G. and Olsman, K. (2004). An approach to teaching architectural and engineering students utilizing computational mechanics software forcepad. *ITcom*, **9**: 219-228.
- Oyadokun, J.O. (2021). Analysis of Academic Performance of Architecture Students in Building Structures in Southwestern Nigerian Public Universities, PhD Thesis, the Department of Architecture, LAUTECH, Ogbomoso (Unpublished).
- Principles and Methods of Teaching. <https://www.lds.org/service/teaching-the-gospel/principles-and-methods-of-teaching>. 2015.05.006

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

- Sajjad, S. (2010). Effective Teaching Methods at Higher Education Level. <http://class.web.nthu.edu.tw/ezfiles/669/img/1381/1.effective-teaching-methods-at-higher-education-level.pdf>. 2015.07.005
- Teaching Styles: Different Teaching Methods and Strategies. education.cu-portland.edu/blog/teaching-strategies/5-types-of-classroom-teaching posted Jan.5, 2013 by Eric Gill in teaching strategies. 2015.07.015.