STUDENTS 'PERCEPTION OF LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK (UNIVERSITY OF BENIN)

AGU GRACE AMARACHI
SSC1611978

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN
BENIN CITY

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Graetz (2006) asserts that all learning takes place in a physical environment with quantifiable and perceptible physical characteristics, be it in a large lecture hall, underneath a tree, or in front of a computer screen. Lizzio, Wilson and Simons (2002) identified the learning environment as a major variable in the interacting system of the learning process.

Learning environment and how it is perceived by the students or learners have been identified as having major influence on both learning processes and outcomes. In this regard, Frenzel, Pekrun and Goetz (2007) reports that numerous studies have clearly demonstrated the significant relationship between perceived learning environmentand student achievement. Randhawa and Michayluk (1974) attribute much of the reliable variance in student performance to the aptitude of the learner and the environment of learning. In the view of Zhu, Valcke, Schellens and Li (2009), the quality of student learning seems to be closely related to their perceptions of the learning environment.

In view of the foregoing, recent years have witnessed an increasing global interest and concern among all educational stakeholders regarding the role of learning environment in education cutting across all levels, from the most basic level of learning, to to the most advanced levels of tertiary education.

The increasing interest in learning environment stems mainly from the fact that the learning environment holds multidimensional implications for various aspects of student learning processes and outcomes. Students motivation and interest, emotional and behavioral disposition of students towards learning, academic performance and achievement have been established as areas on which the learning environment exerts considerable influence (Wei & Elias, 2011; Ludtke, Robitzsch, Trautwein, & Kunter, 2009; Victorian Institute of Teaching, 2007).

In my own personal experiences, I've come across people who wanted to study in a particular tertiary institution of learning because of the school's physical environment in terms of the size, layout, buildings and even student population. In contrast, some people detested some institutions in view of the school's physical environment in terms of smaller school size, unattractive layout, fewer buildings and smaller student population. This is because students' assessments of openness and comfort of the university's learning environment, as well as with the social environment within the university, features prominently in the students' choice of tertiary institution of learning.

In Nigeria, the terms "public" and "private" stands in sharp contrast to each other, both having implications for efficiency and effectiveness in whatever the organizations are into. A sector in which this is more glaring is the nation's educational sector, wherein a clear dividing line exists between private and public institutions of learning across all levels. The private learning institutions are synonymous with efficiency while the public learning institutions are synonymous with inefficiency.

A relevant question that emanates from the ongoing discourse is: Does the type of academic environment within which students are asked to learn (e.g. workload, teaching quality, physical classroom environment) have any real impact on how they approach their learning and the quality of the outcomes they are able to achieve? Another relevant question is: Will students 'do well' and 'not so well' irrespective of their environments?

Learning environments of private learning institutions are generally acclaimed to be relatively more positive than that of public learning institutions (Chandler, Nolin & Zill, 1993). It is possible that studying in a private or public tertiary institution of learning makes different demands on the students attending these institutions.

In view of the increased calls for public-private partnership especially in the education sector, calls for increased efficiency of the public education sector and proliferation of private tertiary institutions in Nigeria, it is important to know to the

extent of the discrepancies in learning environment, how these discrepancies are looked upon by the students, and the impact of these perceptions on various aspects of learning processes and outcomes of the students. This is the basic aim of this research study.

1.2 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

In the view of Abraham, Ramnarayan, Vinod and Torke (2008), the quality of educational environment has been identified to be crucial for effective learning. Most Nigerians, especially students will expect learning institutions to be orderly and well-functioning, thus providing a favorable learning environment.

Prevailing reality in most learning institutions in Nigeria is a far cry from the expectations of stakeholders, mainly parents and students in view of non-conducive learning environment and how schools have even become a breeding ground for violence, antisocial behaviour and other vices, as well as the progressive fall of academic standards. In fact, the environment in most schools are very deplorable and demotivating and as such, do not really foster meaningful and active learning.

While the private tertiary institutions can offer a relatively more positive learning environment (usually because of smaller student population who can afford the very high tuition and accompanying fees), the learning environments of public tertiary institutions

are a testimony of neglect compounded by the huge demand on existing facilities by a large and rapidly increasing student population.

As a result of the foregoing, better classroom organisation, improved lecturer-student relationship (stemming from better lecturer-student ratio) better hostel and living conditions are to be expected in private tertiary institutions of learning. In contrast, classroom organisation in public schools are characterized by overcrowded classrooms, broken boards and chairs, absence of or poor public address systems as well as disruptive behaviour during lessons. Most hostels in public tertiary institutions of learning are in very deplorable and dehumanizing conditions, largely as a result of rising demand on facilities without commensurate maintenance and expansion of physical infrastructure.

The academic environments of public and private institutions of higher learning constitute a significant aspect of student experiences during the duration of their undergraduate programmes. Thus, such a sharp contrast in learning environments as perceived by the students could have huge implications for students' learning processes and learning outcomes. Identifying these perceptions comparatively is the basic purpose of this study.

Current literature on learning environment especially at the university level reflects the perspectives of the educators (school administrations and lecturers) implying

a teacher-centered view of the classroom environment, with little focusing on the perspective of the student (Khaldi and Khatib, 2014). The above trend holds true for Nigeria, wherein studies into students' perception are relatively scarce, in view of the teacher-centredness of the nation's education processes. This is a major gap this study intends to fill. Also, comparative studies into the nation's public and private institutions of higher learning since the emergence of private tertiary institutions in Nigeria are almost non-existent. This is another research gap that the study intends to fill.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study is to comparatively investigate student perceptions of the learning environment in undergraduate programmes of public and private institutions of higher learning. In this regard, this study specifically aims to:

1. Determine if significant discrepancies exist between students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions in their perceptions of their campus environment and physical infrastructure.
2. Ascertain if significant discrepancies exist between students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions in their perceptions of the classroom managementand structure provided by the learning environment.

3. Establish if significant difference exist between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the teacher-students relationship.
4. Establish if significant difference exist between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials.
5. Ascertain if significant difference exist in the perception of students on the impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and desire to learn in public and private institutions of higher learning.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to guide this study, the following research questions were asked:

1. Are there significant discrepancies between students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions in their perceptions of campus environment and physical infrastructure?
2. Are there significant discrepancies in the way classroom management and structure provided by the learning environment is perceived by students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions?
3. Is there a significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the teacher-students relationship as a component of the learning environment?

4. Is there a significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials as components of the learning environment?
5. Is there a significant difference in the perception of students on the impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and desire to learn in public and private institutions of higher learning?

1.5 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

In order to achieve our research objectives, the following research hypotheses were formulated and presented in the null form:

$H_0$1: There is no significant difference between students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions in their perceptions of campus environment and physical infrastructure

$H_0$2: There are no significant discrepancies in the way classroom management and structure provided by the learning environment is perceived by students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions.

$H_0$3: There is no significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the teacher-students relationship as a component of the learning environment.

$H_0$4: There is no significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials as components of the learning environment.

$H_0$5: There is no significant difference in the perception of students on the impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and desire to learn in public and private institutions of higher learning.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The relevance of this study primarily emanates from its focus on students perceptions as critical components of the teaching-learning process. In this regard, this study adds to the slim body of research literature on the perception of the student group as a reference point for future researchers. Thus, this research work is expected to be of benefit to researchers in similar investigations and analysis.

The significance of this study is further reinforced by its comparative nature involving both private and public institutions of higher learning. This is in view of the fact that students' perceptions are constantly changing and differ between different groups of students, as a result of diverse personal characteristics and different individual histories that inform individual differences in students' perceptions.

Also, results and recommendations of the study will form critical inputs for decision makers, policy actors and school administrations in both the private and public sectors, in adjusting existing learning environments as well as developing new learning environments that foster active and meaningful learning among Nigerian undergraduates.

1.7 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of this research study covers all students of undergraduate programmes of both public and private institutions of higher learning in Edo State, Nigeria. In this regard, students are drawn from two private and public institutions each.

1.8 DEFINITION OF TERMS

In the context of this study, the following terms are the operational definitions were adopted.

Students' Perceptions: These are the beliefs or opinions that students have or formulate result of result of direct experiences in the educational context. It is the understanding, mental frame of reference or conclusions acquired by students in their interactions within the academic or educational system.

Learning Environment: The learning environment is the context in which the student works or where learning takes place, consisting of the physical classroom, materials for

learning, instructional processes, teacher-student relationships and student-student relationships.

Undergraduate Programmes: It includes all the post-secondary academic programs in various disciplines offered by post-secondary learning institutions, up to the level of a bachelor's degree in Nigeria.

Comparative Study: A systematized endeavor or effort to compare items, cases or events, with an eye toward identifying points that the items, cases or events hold in common, along with citing areas where they differ.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses existing literature relevant or related to the subject matter of discourse. The chapter begins with the conceptual clarification of the two study variables - student perceptions and learning environment. An overview of learning environment in Nigerian schools is also discussed. Factors affecting students perceptions are identified and discussed as part of our relevant literature. Components of the learning environment and the impact of learning environment on students' learning processes and outcomes are discussed as relevant literature. The chapter terminates with the review of existing literature on students perception of learning environment.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

In this section, relevant definitions of "students' perception" and "learning environment" are provided and discussed as a conceptual basis for our study.

2.2.1 WHAT IS STUDENTS' PERCEPTION?

The term "students' perception" have been extensively employed in literature following the increased scholarly interest on students' perception and as it relates to other

factors in educational process. Despite its rampant usage and attraction of scholarly attention, clear-cut definitions of the term are relatively scarce. Only a hand few definitions of these definitions exist.

In their review of the students' perceptions about learning in higher education, Struyven, Dochy and Janssens (2005), defined students' perceptions as "the beliefs or opinions that students have as a result of realising or noticing something, especially something that is perhaps not obvious to other people, for example: teachers, parents, or outsiders. Explaining further, they stressed that students' perceptions are the result of direct experiences in the educational context, which can be very different from teachers' experiences or parents' experiences of the educational context. As such, by forming perceptions different from other stakeholders, students construct their own world.

The Livio English Dictionary defined perception as "conscious understanding of something"("Perception", 2015). Another contextually relevant definition of perception was given by the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary thus "an idea, a belief or an image you have as a result of how you see or understand" ("Perception", 2006). In view of both definitions provided above, students' perceptions can be defined as created meanings or understanding on the part of students as a result of their pre-school and in-school experiences.

2.2.2 OVERVIEW ON LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: DEFINITIONS AND COMPONENTS

Numerous definitions from simple to very elaborate, has been given as to what learning environment is, due to its attraction of broad scholarly research. Few of these definitions will be discussed here. Also, in this section the various components of learning environment are discussed as identified in existing literature.

WHAT IS LEARNING ENVIRONMENT?

The Partnership for 21st Century Learning (2008) simply define learning environment as a place and space – a school, a classroom, a library. Osakinle, Onijigin and Falana (2010) takes the idea even further by explaining "environment to the learner" as the type of home and family the learner/child comes from as well as where the learning takes place. Frenzel Pekrun and Goetz (2007) stretches the idea further by conceptualising learning environments in terms of observable characteristics, such as school buildings, materials used for instruction, as well as externally observed interactions between and among learners and instructors.

Alabi, Oduwaiye and Fasasi (2012) refer to learning environment as the totality of internal and external influences surrounding a school. For Phillips, McNaught and

Kennedy (2010), the learning environment provides the context in which the student works, which facilitate the learning processes undertaken by students. Ogbeda and Mukulu (2013) define learning environment as a dynamic and comprehensive picture of all those influences that mold physical, emotional, psychological and social life of the members of the school.

Doppelt and Schunn (2008) conceptualized learning environment in two ways. First, they define learning environment as the physical activities in the classroom (e.g. experiments, kits, computers), as well as the teaching methods, the type of learning in which pupils are engaged, and assessment methods. From another perspective, they define learning environment as the psychology, sociology and pedagogy of the contexts in which learning takes place and their influence on pupils' achievement in the cognitive and affective domains.

In view of the foregoing, the learning environment has been explained as embodying more than merely physical space, consisting of the entire learning setting, including instructional processes, teachers-student relationships, as well as student-student relationships. In sum, the learning environment refers to the physical space (lecture, administrative, residential and recreational buildings), education-enhancing technology and learning materials and relationships which provides the all-encompassing context within which the learning processes produces learning outcomes.

COMPONENTS OF LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Phillips, McNaught and Kennedy (2010) conceptualized learning as having three components: the environment which facilitates learning (learning environment), the activities which are part of learning (learning processes) and the knowledge, behaviours, skills or understanding which can be demonstrated (learning otcomes). The learning environment forms a critical component of learning, being the medium through which the learning processes produces learning outcomes.

The learning environment is a multidimensional construct. The broad nature of learning environment as a term can be inferred from the view of Arul and Vimala (2012) that the educational process of development occurs in physical, social, cultural and psychological environment. In this regard, the components of learning environment well transcend the physical infrastructure of the school as conceptually clarified above. Several scholars have identified different components of the learning environment.

Phillips, McNaught and Kennedy (2010) identify the campus setting, the structure of the degree program, the student's individual units of study, the nature of technologies employed in the teaching-learning process, the teacher's design of the learning and assessment activities as components of the learning environment.

Udoh (2012) identified the components of learning environment to include use of teaching/learning materials, orienting students, quantity of instruction, classroom context, teachers' perception, home characteristics, school location, school characteristics, teachers characteristics, examining students, teachers' autonomy, managing students and students' perception.

Alabi, Oduwaiye and Fasasi (2012) acknowledge that a school learning environment comprises physical, academic, social and cultural components. The physical environment is made up of school location, physical feature and structures within and outside the school. Academic component consist of curricular and co-curricular activities in which teachers and learners engage in classroom, libraries, laboratories and other places in the school. Social component is created through interaction among classrooms and other places in the school. The cultural components consists of rules, regulation, values and discipline and all school activities meant to acquaint learners with societal culture and give the school its own tradition.

Kagoda (2011) identified the building design, size of the classrooms and the general infrastructure including library facilities, staffroom, toilets, school compound and play ground school as physical components of the learning environment. Furthermore, a school's social, cultural and economic contexts as well as the nature of school administration are important components of the learning environment.

Duruji, Azuh and Oviasogie (2013) identified the components of learning environment to include general infrastructure encompassing classroom spaces, administrative spaces, circulation spaces, convenience (leisure and recreational) spaces, classroom location and structure, availability of instructional facilities and accessories, libraries and information centers, technical workshops, information and communication technology facilities, multipurpose halls and performing art spaces, laboratories, health, physical exercises and play grounds, sanitation, maintenance culture, aesthetics as well as the teachers and students.

Okoza, Aluede and Akpaida (2012) acknowledge that the learning environment is the whole range of components and activities within which learning happens. In this regard they identify school location and physical buildings, laboratory equipment, library services and materials, instructional aids, effective classroom management, class size, teachers' attitude and motivation and students' home environment and family background as components of the learning environment.

In a survey study of parents and student perceptions of school learning environment in the USA, Chandler, Nolin and Zill (1993) identified several aspects of the learning environment namely academic challenge, enjoyment of school, mutual respect between teachers and students, discipline maintained by teachers and school administrations and peer norms.

2.3 AN OVERVIEW OF LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN NIGERIAN INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING

As established above, the learning environment provides the context within which a student works and makes a connection between the learning processes and learning outcomes. As such, students spend a great deal of their active hours within the school environment.

Across all levels of education in Nigeria, from the pre-nursery to the tertiary level of schooling, the state of learning environment is grossly inadequate in terms of the set objectives of each level as well as the existing demand for education as shown by overwhelming student populations. Existing studies on learning institutions in Nigeria all present a gloomy picture of learning environments in Nigeria.

Alabi, Oduwaiye and Fasasi (2012) gave a snapshot of the infrastructural state of Nigerian primary schools prior to the launch of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Nigeria in 1999. They report that the sites of many primary schools were appalling and not inviting, where roofs of many schools had fallen off, buildings were dilapidated and no enough seats for the pupils to sit.

The Federal Government of Nigeria (2006) stipulated that the criteria for utilization of UBE intervention fund as 70% for infrastructural development, while textbooks and working materials attract only 15%. As a result, primary schools began to wear new looks following the launch of the UBE in 1999. There was a deliberate effort towards improvement of the physical environment of primary schools wherein a number of new buildings were built, a large number being repaired as well as provision of classroom furniture, laboratory/workshop equipment, introductory technology equipment, borehole construction and provision of toilets. Notwithstanding, Alabi, Oduwaiye & Fasasi (2012) report that many primary schools in urban and rural centres are constrained by their learning environments from achieving up to expected standards.

In another study of the learning environment of primary schools in Nigeria, Olaleye (2012) reports that the primary school learning environment are characterized by among other things:

1. Inadequate classroom space, furniture, equipment for teaching and learning.
2. Lack of easy access to safe drinking water, hygienic sanitation, and health facilities.
3. Poorly motivated teachers.
4. Use of sub-standard teaching methodologies.

Okpala (2000) corroborates the above view, reporting that many school children in Nigeria learn under the shade of trees while many sit on the floor to learn in their classrooms. In similar vein, Ndukwe (2002) reports that many schools lack adequate games and recreational facilities. On the basis of her analysis, Olaleye (2012) conclude that is evidently clear that the learning environment in Nigeria cannot be regarded as child-friendly.

In a snapshot of learning environment in Nigerian secondary schools, Akporehe (2011) reports that the school environments are not clean enough to attract even the most willing students. Furthermore, the overcrowded building is not only repulsive but energy-sapping as students struggle and wrestle over sitting positions, while students lean on the walls and hang near windows to listen to the teacher in some cases.

In a related study of learning environment in Nigerian secondary schools, Ajayi, Ekundayo and Osalusi (2010) asserts that a number of schools around the country are still languishing in the old architectural designs, with crumbling walls and limited resources. Thus, a cursory look at the learning environment in some secondary schools shows that many of the classrooms, laboratories, examination halls, libraries and office furniture are in a terrible state in need of repairs.

The situation in tertiary institutions is not very different. Obomanu (2011) opine that learning environment are not yet made conducive for both the teacher and the learner as funds allocated to educational institutions for infrastructural development are regularly misappropriated, and related records falsified. Also, heads of tertiary institutions rather resort to providing sub-standard infrastructure that cannot meet the growing need of improving educational facilities.

The dearth of infrastructure in the public universities is sickening and runs short of an ideal academic environment, wherein students learn in dilapidated buildings, environmentally depressing and learning disabling situations (Salami, 2001; Onyekakeyah, 2000). Ogu (2008) identified infrastructural inadequacies as one of key challenges facing Nigerian universities, posing hindrance to learning and research work. In this regard, Ogu (2008) report that a good number of Nigerian universities are offer education programs without the basic infrastructure to run the program.

Using the University of Ado-Ekiti as a case study of learning environment in Nigerian state universities, Osakinle, Onijigin and Falana (2010) find out that lecture halls are not conducive. Akpan (1998) report that hostel accommodations in Nigerian universities features declining supply and depreciating stock of infrastructural amenities vis-a-vis a rapidly increasing student population, leading to overcrowding and deplorable states of hostel facilities. Reinforcing the above view, Ubong (2007) asserts that Nigerian

tertiary institutions of learning have over the years, unfortunately not been able to keep the hostels even in minimum residential conditions largely because of paucity of funds and corruption.

Using the University of Benin as a case study in the analysis of the learning environment of Nigerian varsity students, Ojogwu and Alutu (2009) report that the learning environment was very much below standard. Specifically, Ojogwu and Alutu (2009) report that the space provided for most departments in the University of Benin is by no means adequate for lectures or practical. The classroom spaces are small overcrowded and poorly ventilated and having broken and inadequate seats and boards. Consequently, most students stand as there are not enough seats, while lectures go on or for up to three hours, thereby making teaching and learning unpleasant and uninteresting. The central library and most departmental libraries of the University are serving far more students than planned for, and are usually lacking in current literature, seats, serene reading environment as well as adequate modern library technology. Some lecturers and non-academic staffs have no adequate office space thereby obstructing meaningful staff-student interaction.

Shortage of resources (human and material), mismanagement of funds and consequent neglect of the learning environment, explosion in student enrolment, lack of maintenance culture, pedagogical factors, (teaching methods and curriculum

implementation), distortion of academic programmes by students' unrest and academic and non-academic staff strikes are some of the factors identified by Ojogwu and Alutu (2009) as responsible for the above trend.

Tsavga (2011) assert that desire for both qualitative and quantitative education has multiplied the problem of providing an effective and conducive learning environment for teaching and learning in Nigeria, where an increase in the number of students' enrolment in schools takes place with little or no regards to improving the learning environment so as to better their performance.

As an offshoot of the above reality of learning environment in Nigerian tertiary institutions, students' welfare in Nigeria higher institutions are grossly inadequate, with the lingering welfare problems of continued power failure, absence of pipe-borne water for the students, inadequate transportation systems. Idogho (2011) opine that tertiary institutions in Nigeria, like many other African countries, have become modern-day ghettos where students studying under these conditions tend to lose sleep, lose concentration and cannot be expected to behave normally.

Living and learning under such dehumanizing/sorrowful conditions in tertiary institutions makes one's study period a very painful experience that negates meaningful learning. In sum, most of the Nigerian school environments are not conducive enough for

the development of appropriate skills, knowledge, interests and attitude in individuals to become responsible citizens.

2.4 IMPLICATIONS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES: A REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Students spend a great deal of their waking hours at school. Arul and Vimala (2012) points out that the child spends most of his time in school, wherein the school environment exerts a significant influence on the student's performance and personality development through curricula, teaching techniques and relationships. Thus, the importance of learning environment for successful academic achievement and optimal learning outcomes cannot be overemphasized.

In fact, the pivotal role of the learning environment in one's learning experience starts right from childhood. Hence, the Office of Early Childhood Development (2008) points out that the physical and psychological components of the learning environment dramatically affect children's cognitive, social, and emotional development during the critical years of childhood.

Duruji, Azuh and Oviasogie (2013) provide another perspective on the relevance of the learning environment to educational development. In this regard, they opine that

the relevance of learning environments can be seen from the high premium placed on learning environments by relevant authorities and regulatory institutions. They hold the belief that a school with adequate learning environment contributes to stir up expected outcomes of learning that will facilitate good academic performance, by encouraging effective teaching and learning. As such, learning environment remains an important area that should be studied and well managed to enhance students' academic performance.

Tsavga (2011) maintains that the learning environment plays a vital role in determining how students perform or respond to circumstances and situations around them. The learning environment determines to a large extent how a student behaves and interacts, given that the environment in which we find ourselves tend to mould our behaviour so as to meet the demands of life whether negatively or positively.

Higgins, Hall, Wall, Woolner and McCaughey (2005) provide a body of literary evidence showing the impact of learning environment on student achievement, engagement, affective state, attendance and well-being. They report that improvement in the conduciveness of a school's physical environment has significant benefits for teachers and students. Furthermore, effective interactions between staffs, students and other users of school buildings exert an influence on behaviour, well-being and attainment.

Aggarwal (2006) opine that the learners environment have to be conducive since the school is expected to be an extension of the home. Given the pivotal role of higher education in national development, the provision of a conducive learning environment cannot be overemphasized. In this regard, Kinzie (2010) state that

> *"....to ensure that all students graduate and make the most of their undergraduate education, universities must first ensure the learning environment provides rich and educationally meaningful opportunities..."* (p. 140).

Ogbeda and Muluku (2013) acknowledge that intelligence is not the only determinant of academic achievement, as academic performance of a student is always associated with many components of learning environment. Thus, the implications of learning environment for the learning outcome of students will be discussed in terms of the following components of the learning environment:

1. Physical infrastructure and campus environment.
2. Classroom management and structure.
3. Teacher-student relationship.

4. Quality of instructional procedure and materials.
5. Influence of learning environment on student motivation.

2.4.1 PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

The physical infrastructure and campus environment of a learning institution is usually what comes to mind when the term "learning environment" is mentioned, given that it is the most observable component of the learning environment which provides space for school work. In this regard, the Office of Early Childhood Development (2008) stressed that the physical components of a learning institution must be carefully planned, implemented, monitored, and revised on an ongoing basis in order promote effective learning, to serve stakeholders in the program (i.e., learners, colleagues, practitioners, families and the community-at-large).

Greatz (2006) from another psychological perspective opine that the physical characteristics of learning environments can affect learners emotionally, with important cognitive and behavioral consequences. Clearly, some learning environments are more comfortable and offer fewer distractions than others. In this regard, most students would probably find learning difficult in a classroom with deplorable physical conditions and a huge number of distractions. In contrast, environments that are more comfortable and offer less distractions elicit positive emotional responses may lead not only to enhanced learning but also to a powerful, emotional attachment to that space, where students love

to learn, a place they seek out when they wish to learn, and a place they remember fondly when they reflect on their learning experiences.

From an economic viewpoint, PricewaterhouseCoopers (2001) on the basis of a study in Great Britain linked capital investment (investment in infrastructure) to academic achievement and other outcomes such as teacher motivation, school leadership, and student time spent on learning. Combining both quantitative and qualitative analysis, PricewaterhouseCoopers (2001) provide results that show that:

1. Good teaching takes place in schools with a good physical environment.
2. Good school leadership can also be found in schools with a high-quality physical infrastructure.
3. The general attitudes, behavior, and relationships amongst pupils and staff are more conducive to learning in those schools which have had significant capital investments on high-quality physical infrastructure.

Victorian Institute of Teaching (2007) report that studies about student academic achievement and building condition conclude that the quality of the physical environment significantly affects student achievement. Higgins et al (2005) opine that the design of the school environment, internal and external, has profound effects on the activities and

outcomes of teaching and learning, both formal and non-formal. In a similar vein, Earthman (2004) states that:

> *"There is sufficient research to state without equivocation that the building in which students spends a good deal of their time learning does in fact influence how well they learn"* (p. 18).

In higher education, Greatz (2006) stressed the need to provide learning places that are comfortable, offer less distractions and elicit positive emotional attachments to the space from students, rather than just build large lecture halls and attempt to squeeze students into crowded, noisy, and uncomfortable spaces.

The plethora of research on the impact of the physical condition of learning spaces shows that learning, students' engagement, attainment, attendance and wellbeing are adversely affected by inadequate physical conditions relating to seating and furnishings, spatial density, level of noise and quality of teachers' voice, temperature, air quality, lightings, aesthetic design of buildings and play-yards and vandalism (Jacobs, 2009; Greatz, 2006; Schneider, 2002).

The empirical evidence provided by these studies show that learning appears to be affected adversely by inadequate light, extreme temperatures and loud noises. Thus, Jacobs (2009) acknowledge that availability of lighting systems that mimic natural light

have been found to have a positive effect on school attendance, achievement, growth and development. Schneider (2002) show that students perform mental task better when classrooms are at moderate temperature and humidity. Excessive and sustained background noise can hinder learning, by competing with the speech of teachers, aides, classmates, and audio-educational media, thereby having a detrimental impact on learning and achievement (Newman, 2009).

2.4.2 CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND STRUCTURE

Teachers are faced with classroom issues such as excessive talking during instruction, getting out of seat without permission, throwing objects across the room, sleeping during classroom instruction and disrespect to the teacher. Effective teaching and learning cannot take place in an environment where students are disorderly and disrespectful, and where there is an apparent absence of rules and procedures to guide behavior.

In such situations, chaos becomes the norm and both teachers and students suffer where teachers struggle to teach, and students most likely learn much less than they ought to. The need for well-managed classrooms where meaningful teaching and learning can take place emphasizes the need for "classroom management".

Olorunfemi-Olabisi (2013) defines classroom management as involving adequate class control, classroom organization, cleanliness and sitting arrangement. Furthermore, the leadership styles of the teacher in the classroom as well as the effective use of class discipline with adequate reinforcement are also elements of classroom management.

Olusunde and Akinpelu (2012) define classroom management as orchestration of the learning environment of a group of individual within a classroom setting. They opine that the need for classroom management emanate from the fact class activities involve teachers working with students who have different dispositions and abilities. Thus, teachers must be prepared to create, implement and maintain an environment in which learning is the centre.

Emmer and Stough (2001) define classroom management and structure as involving physically orienting the classroom for instruction, preparing and organizing materials, and framing lessons in a coherent and logical manner. In their opinion, implementation of good classroom management establishes order, engages students, elicits student cooperation, with an ultimate purpose to establish and maintain an environment conducive to instruction and learning.

In a study of classroom management in some schools in Lagos, Omomia and Omomia (2014) acknowledge that effective classroom management procedures promote

independent learning and are success for all students in classrooms which are productive, orderly and pleasant. Marzano, Marzano and Pickering (2003) on the basis of their quantitative analysis provide evidence that the effective use of classroom management strategies favourably impacts student engagement and student achievement.

2.4.3 TEACHER AND STUDENT RELATIONSHIP

The APA Work Group of the Board of Educational Affairs (1997) emphasised the "social influence of learning", stressing that learning is influenced by social interactions, interpersonal relations, and communication with others. Moreover, learning occurs best in an environment that contains positive interpersonal relationships and interactions and in which the learner feels appreciated, acknowledged, respected, and admired. In this regard, Klem and Connell (2004) opine that students must be able access support from their teachers in order to effectively learn what is offered from the curriculum.

Research evidence linking student-teacher relationships with student achievement has been consistent across grade levels. In fact, the interaction between teachers and students having huge implications for students' learning process and outcomes starts right from childhood. As such, children who experienced conflicted teacher-student relationships within the first grade demonstrated lower academic achievement motivation

and had long-term consequences for their academic motivation and achievement (Buyse, Verschueren, Verachtert, & Van Damme, 2009; Hamre & Pianta, 2001).

Liberante (2012) identifies the teacher–student relationship as one of the most powerful elements within the learning environment, agreeing that teacher–student relationships form the basis of the social context in which learning takes place, affecting students' development, school engagement and academic motivation. Hughes and Chen (2011) assert that supportive and positive relationships between teachers and students ultimately promote a "sense of school belonging" and encourage students to "participate cooperatively in classroom activities.

Paswan and Young (2002) stresses that student–teacher interaction allows for the opportunity to ask questions, express ideas, and have an open discussion in class. Non-threatening interactions allow students to ask questions, practice the free expression of ideas, develop their own skills, and improve class discussion. As such, teachers who make an effort to have positive interactions with students, make a difference in the academic and social development of their student.

Knoell (2012) asserts that the student-teacher relationships have shown to be an important factor in student success in the classroom. Thus, the teacher-student relationships are influential on students' success in school. Lee (2007) in his own study

found that the trust developed between the student and the teacher can contribute to students' academic performance.

2.4.4 QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURE AND MATERIALS

The Great Russian Encyclopedia (2010) define the instructional procedure as system for the organization of education that is based on the interdependence between teaching and learning which seeks to achieve the aims of instruction and upbringing and is governed by curricula, programs of study, and other educational programs followed in that educational institution. Specifically, instructional procedure includes all types of required work: classwork, lectures, seminars, laboratory work, practice teaching, and production training; it also includes extracurricular activities.

Kizlik (2015) opine that instructional or teaching method mean the same thing. He defined teaching or instructional method as the objective-oriented activities and flow of information between teachers and students. According to O'Bannon (2002) instructional methods are ways that information is presented to students. Teaching methods are guides for designing educational activities, environments and experiences.

Odundo and Gunga (2013) reports that there is considerable empirical evidence that instructional methods adopted by teachers influence learning achievement significantly. These studies show that appropriate instructional methods would facilitate

grasping of new concepts, while inappropriate methods are likely to constrain knowledge retention and application (Chang, 2010).

In a study of the impact of teaching method on student achievement in Biology, Ikitde and Edet (2013) opine that the interest which students show in science subjects and the mastery they demonstrate on completion of a course of study depend on the teaching method. Furthermore, they acknowledge the consensus among some researchers that it is the teaching method and not the teacher that is the key to the learning of science.

Quite remarkably, regular poor academic performance by the majority students is fundamentally linked to application of ineffective teaching methods by teachers to impact knowledge to learners (Adunola, 2011). Substantial research on the effectiveness of teaching methods indicates that the quality of teaching is often reflected by the achievements of learners.

Students' academic performance depends a great deal on the instructional materials used. This is because instructional materials help to make instructions practical and real thereby facilitating the understanding of the instruction. In the view of Nwike and Onyejegbu (2013), achieving an effective teaching and learning process requires instructional materials which they define as the different teaching aids or apparatus which a classroom teacher employs to facilitate his or her teaching for the achievement of the

stated objective. Results from their study show that students taught with instructional materials performed better than those taught without.

With focus on instructional materials and students achievement in physics, Oladejo, Olosunde, Ojebisi and Isola (2011) report that the teaching of physics without instructional materials certainly result in poor academic achievement, as the mastery of physics concepts might not be fully achieved without the use of instructional materials. In conclusion, they opine that the place of instructional materials in the effective implementation of any education programme cannot be under-mined, in that instructional materials extends the range of experience available to learners, supplement and complement the teacher's verbal explanations.

2.4.5 INFLUENCE OF LEARNING ENVIRONMENT ON STUDENT MOTIVATION

The place of motivation in attaining optimal student outcomes cannot be over-emphasized. In this regard, Lee, Yin and Zhang (2009) reports the research consensus that student motivation is one of the most powerful determinants of students' success and failure in school. In the view of Williams and Williams (2011) motivation is probably the most important factor that educators can target in order to improve learning. This is because motivated learners are more likely to undertake challenging activities, to be

actively engaged, to enjoy and adopt a deep approach to learning, and to exhibit enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity (Hartnett, St. George, & Dron, 2011).

Hartnett, St. George, and Dron (2011) reports student motivation to be complex, multifaceted, and sensitive to situational conditions. The learning environment has been shown to be one of the prominent situational conditions affecting student motivation. In this regard, Williams and Williams (2011) identify the environment as one of five key ingredients for improving student motivation. Some specific environmental components they identified as exerting influence on students' motivation include peer social interaction, supportive teacher relationships and administrative structures, appropriateness of classrooms and adequacy of teaching materials.

The relevance of learning environment as a critical factor in student motivation can be seen from the view of Adler, Milne and Stablein (2011) that a student's inherent or baseline motivation will be enhanced or blunted by the motivating potential (or lack thereof) of the classroom setting. Herein, they identified the level of perceived or actual autonomy and type and timing of the feedback provided by the learning environment as having significant impact on students' motivation.

Hanrahan (1998) emphasized the impact of sociological aspect of the learning environment on students' motivation. Herein, teacher-student relationship, teaching

methods, and a supportive academic community are the relevant factors that affect student motivation. In a similar vein, Young (2005) identified such factors as teaching style, perceived autonomy as well as fair performance-based reward systems as sociological aspects of the learning environment that affects student motivation.

In sum, the environment must be of a quality or caliber that contributes to the motivation of the students by being available, accessible, safe and allows for openness and freedom to learn from mistakes.

2.5 REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE ON STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: COMPARATIVE DIFFERENCES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME AND PERFORMANCE.

Students' perception about their learning environment has far-reaching multi-dimensional implications for the entire teaching-learning process. As such, Den Brok, Brekelmans and Wubbels (2006) opine that student perceptions of the learning environment are considered to have a pervasive influence. At the most basic level, students' perceptions of the learning environment influence how a student learns (Entwistle, 1991). In a similar vein, Zhu, Valcke, Schellens and Li (2009) stress that the quality of student learning seems to be closely related to their perceptions of the learning

environment, and as such is an important predictor of student academic performance and learning outcomes.

However, differences in student perceptions do exist, given that students come from diverse backgrounds and bring prior experiences to their present learning contexts. In view of the foregoing, this literature review will focus on difference in perceptions among various student groups and the implications of students' perception for their learning outcomes.

2.5.1 DIFFERING PERCEPTIONS AMONG STUDENT GROUPS

Khaldi and Khatib (2014) comparatively investigated students' perceptions of the learning environment (student cohesiveness, teacher support, involvement, task orientation and cooperation) in business and management colleges at the undergraduate level in several private and public Kuwaiti universities. The findings of the study showed positive effects of the learning environment on students' attitude toward their academic institution. However, students' attitude towards their institution was significantly higher for public universities than private ones which might be due to the long heritage and previously stored positive image of public universities.

In contrast, results from Khaldi and Khatib (2014) show that private universities were evaluated significantly higher than public ones in the four dimensions of teacher

support, involvement, task orientation, and student cooperation. This is largely as a result of the relatively small number of students in the classrooms of private universities which enables students to be task oriented, cooperate and be involved much more than students within public universities were the classroom is significantly bigger and the number of students is much larger.

Xu (2011) studied the differences in perceptions of Chinese and American students toward higher education, given that study programs abroad differ from the educational and cultural backgrounds of the home countries of students. The study shows that USA and Chinese students differ in the perceptions of the university learning environment with regards to problems of university as well as the purpose, duties and goals of the university.

Wierstra, Kanselaar, Van Der Linden and Lodewijks (1999) investigated the learning environment perceptions of Dutch Students and other European University Students studying within the framework of international exchange programs, wherein students in one European country studies in another European country. Given that the university exchange programme confronted students with a learning environment which differed considerably from what they were used to in their home country, results of the study show that large differences in student perceptions of the university learning environment exist between Netherlands and South European countries. Specifically, the

students showed different perceptions of the teaching methods and teachers' receptiveness.

Abraham, Ramnarayan, Vinod and Torke (2008) comparatively studied the perceptions of first year and clinical phase students regarding the learning environment at an Indian Medical School (the Manipal Campus of the Melaka Manipal Medical College-MMMC) as well as the differences in the perceptions of the learning environment by the male and female students. Results of the study show that first year students were found to be more satisfied with the learning environment at MMMC compared to the clinical batch students. However, there was not much difference in the students' perceptions gender wise.

Kimani, Kagira and Kendi (2011) conducted a comparative analysis of business students' perceptions of service quality offered by by public and private universities in rural and urban areas in Kenya. Results of the study showed positive perceptions on the part of students from both urban and rural public and private universities about several aspects of the learning environment including university administration, lecture halls, students' cafeteria, library, residential halls, switch board, student support, academic staff, general institution and students' welfare. However, the comparative analysis reveal slight divergence in the positive perceptions held by students with rural private university

having the most positive perception, followed by urban public university, urban public university, and the rural public university having the least positive perception.

Mortagy and Boghikian-Whitby (2010) comparatively studied the perceptions of online and face-to-face students about e-learning environment over an eight-year period. First they obtain results that the perceptions of online students changed over time, while that of face-to-face students remained fairly constant or showed very little change over time. Also, results of the study show that online and face-to face students differ significantly in their perception of course activities, interactions with instructors, and interactions with other students.

2.5.2 STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

Okoza, Aluede and Akpaida (2012) investigated the perception of students on the influence of environment variables (classroom environment, teachers' method of teaching and family condition) on their academic performance. Results of their study show that classroom environment (classroom conduciveness and class size) and teaching methods (teacher use of teaching aids and motivation) are perceived by students as having significant impact on their academic achievement.

Frenzel, Pekrun, Goetz (2007) stressed that achievement has been the number-one variable considered as an outcome of perceived classroom environment, on the basis of

numerous evidence that the perceived learning environment is significantly related to student achievement as well as social and emotional outcomes. Results of their study shows that perceptions held by mathematics students about several aspects of the learning environment have a significant impact on students' emotional dispositions towards learning mathematics as a subject.

In the view of Klem and Connell (2004), when students perceive that teachers are supportive and that they are participants in a classroom where expectations are appropriate, fair and clearly communicated, students demonstrate better attendance and score higher on assessments. This same student perception has been shown to be predictors of high school graduation rates and the number of students pursuing a college education.

Wei and Elias (2011) examined the relationship between students' perception of classroom environment and their motivation in learning English Language. Their findings indicated that students' perceived affiliation was the most important dimension of classroom environment which had a significant impact on students' extrinsic motivation. Thus, students' extrinsic motivation to learn was stimulated most directly through affiliation in the classrooms involving communication and socialization between students and between students and teachers.

Olorunfemi-Olabisi (2013) investigated students' perception of teachers' factors (teachers' attitude, method of teaching and classroom management) in the teaching and learning of English Language in secondary schools in Nigeria. The findings revealed that expected performance of students in English Language is based on both the perceived and actual teachers' attitude, method of teaching the subject and classroom management.

Khaldi and Khatib (2014) in their study of the impact of five dimensions of the learning environment (student cohesiveness, teacher support, involvement, task orientation and cooperation) on students' attitude toward their academic institution find that a positive classroom learning environment is linked to positive student outcomes, including attitudes.

Lizzio, Wilson and Simons (2002) explored the relationship between university students' perceptions of their academic environment, their approaches to study, and academic outcomes at both university and faculty levels. Analysis of the responses of a large cross-disciplinary sample of undergraduate students confirmed that students' perceptions has a majorly influence on both 'hard' (academic achievement) and 'soft' (satisfaction and development of key skills) learning outcomes. Also, students' perceptions of their current learning environment were found to be a stronger predictor of learning outcomes at university than prior achievement at school. Finally, perceptions of heavy workload and inappropriate assessment influenced students towards surface

approaches to study, while perceptions of good teaching towards influenced students towards deep approaches to study.

In sum, the above literature discussed show that different student groups holds different perceptions about their learning environment and these perceptions have a significant on student learning outcomes.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter explains the research techniques adopted and used for this study, with the aim of achieving the research objectives. Thus, this chapter of the research study discusses the research design, population and sample and sampling techniques of the study as well as the research instruments, method of data collection and the method of data analysis amongst others.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Survey research design was used in this study. The survey research design is an efficient way of collecting information from a large number of respondents and allows for the use of statistical techniques to determine statistical significance (Denscombe, 2003).

This research strategy was considered necessary because of its ability to view comprehensively and in detail the major questions raised in the study. Also, it was considered appropriate as it is useful for the study of non-observable events such as opinions, attitudes preferences or dispositions (Soyombo, 2002, Fubara & Mguni, 1995).

The design was adopted because the study involves the use of a representative sample from the population and the drawing of conclusion based on the analysis of available data.

3.3 STUDY POPULATION

A population is the entire set of relevant units of analysis in which the researcher is interested for the purpose of the study (Oaikhenan & Udegbunam, 2004). Since this study involves the perception of undergrads about learning environment in both public and private tertiary institutions in Edo State, the population of the study is defined as all public and private tertiary institutions of learning and their students in Edo State.

3.4 SAMPLE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

The sample of the study comprises of students drawn from four universities in Edo State, drawn on the basis on location and age. Two public universities (federal and state) and two private universities are chosen from the Benin Metropolis, as well as other locations in Edo State not offering the level of commercial life and sophistication found in the Benin Metropolis. The two public schools chosen are:

1. University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State (UNIBEN-Federal).
2. Ambrose Ali University, Ekpoma, Edo State (AAU-State).

The two private schools schools chosen are:

1. Igbenedion University, Okada, Edo State (IU).

2. Benson Idahosa University, Benin City, Edo State (BIU).

A total of 120 respondents are drawn from the four schools. The respondents are chosen using the simple random sampling technique from several departments of each school, spanning medicine and other sciences, law, engineering, as well as the social and management sciences. All members in the sample are drawn randomly at the various schools where the respondents were approached for participation in the study.

3.5 DATA FOR THE STUDY: INSTRUMENTATION

Both secondary and primary data were used for the study. Secondary data were sourced from various books and journals relevant to the research topic. The internet proved to be an indispensable and veritable source of information for this study.

The primary data was generated from the field survey carried out by the researcher. Specifically, primary data were obtained from the target respondents through a carefully constructed questionnaire.

3.5.1 Instrumentation

The instrument for data collection is a 28-item questionnaire divided into two (2) sections. Section A was designed to obtain background information on respondents. Section B contained fixed-response questions measuring the perception of respondent

groups on the subject matter and other relevant issues raised in the research hypotheses and objectives of this study.

The questionnaire was constructed using a five-point Likert type scale. The respondents were required to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with each of the statements on a score of one (1) to five (5). A score of one (1) represented strong disagreement with the statement, while a score of five (5) represented strong agreements.

3.5.2 Validity of Instrument

The Cronbach Alpha reliability test is carried out for the research instrument. The suitability and the coherence of the questionnaire was validated by the project supervisor, in order to make sure of the scale validity, and to make sure that included questions capture the study variables.

3.6 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The primary data collected were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive method described the demography of the respondents and other variables in the study using percentages and frequency counts. The inferential methods involved the use of simple arithmetic mean, standard deviation, percentages and the t-test as statistical techniques to test the research hypotheses formulated for the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the research work basically deals with the analysis of the responses in the questionnaire, with which the research hypotheses of the study are tested. One hundred and twenty (120) copies of questionnaires were administered for the study. Only100 copies were returned and properly filled, implying a 83.33% response rate. Moreover, reliability tests show that the research instrument is reliable. As such, the reliability test gives a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.928 implying a high level of internal consistency of the scales and questions in the research instrument. The socio-demographic details of the respondents are presented first.

4.2 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

Table 4.2.1 one presents socio-demographic details, showing the distribution of the respondents between private and public schools, faculties, as well as their gender and age distribution.

TABLE 4.2.1: SCHOOL TYPE, FACULTY, AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES	FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (%)	CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE
SCHOOL TYPE			
Private	48	48.0	48.0
Public	52	52.0	100.00
TOTAL	**100**	**100.0**	
GENDER			
Male	47	47.0	47.0
Female	53	53.0	100.0
TOTAL	**100**	**100.0**	
FACULTY			
Medicine	9	9.o	9.0
Other Sciences	14	14.0	23.0
Law	12	12.0	35.0
Engineering	15	15.0	50.0
Social Science	20	20.0	70.0
Mgt Science	18	18.0	88.0
Education	12	12.0	100.0
TOTAL	**100**	**100.0**	
AGE			
16-20 Years	19	19.0	19.0
21-25Years	45	45.0	64.0
26-30Years	30	30.0	94.0
31+ Years	6	6.0	100
TOTAL	**100**	**100.0**	

SOURCE: Field Survey by Researcher, 2015. Compiled using SPSS version 20.0.

Table 4.2.1 shows that 48 (48.0%) of the respondents attend private universities, while 52 of the respondents (52.0%) attend public universities. Also, 47 (47.0%) of the respondents were males and 53 (53.0%) of the respondents were females (52.0%). This

shows that that the views of respondents were fairly sought between students from private and public universities, as well as between both genders.

Also, table 4.2.1 shows a fair representation of all faculties in the study. The social sciences had the highest (20; 20.0%) in terms of number of respondents sampled from a given faculty. Next to the social sciences is management sciences with 18 respondents (18.0%). Nonetheless, from the faculties of medicine, other sciences and engineering, a total of 38 respondents (38.0%) were sampled, to allow for the views of students from practical-based ctheses. From both the faculties of Law and Medicine, 12 (12.0%) respondents each were sampled.

Nineteen (19.0%) of the respondents were within the 16-20 age bracket. The bulk of respondents were from the 21-25 and 26-30age groups. From both age groups, we have a total of 75 (75.0%) respondents, with the 21-25 age group having the highest number of respondents (45; 45.0%).Only 6 (6.0%) were 31 years and above. From the age distribution, one can deduce that most of the respondents are most likely to be in their penultimate or final year. Thus, most of the respondents have the required amount of school experiences to provide answers to the questions raised in the research instrument.

4.3 ANALYZING RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND TEST OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0, responses from the questionnaires are collated and used to answer the research questions using the simple percentage analysis. Also, the responses are used to obtain the relevant T-value of the Independent T-test adopted to test the research hypotheses. The Independent T-test here basically entails comparing the accompanying p-value of the obtained T-value value to the 0.05 significance level.

4.3.1 Analyzing Research Question One and Hypothesis One

Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 are used in the analysis of the first research question and hypothesis. These questions border on how students from private and public tertiary institutions view the campus environment and physical infrastructure of their respective schools.The frequency distribution of responses to the above questions as obtained and analyzed is presented in frequency table 4.3.1 below.

FREQUENCY TABLE 4.3.1

RESPONSES

QS	SCHOOL	SA	A	UN	D	SD	TOTAL
1	Private	11 (22.9)	22 (45.8)	10 (20.8)	5 (10.4)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	6 (11.6)	2 (3.8)	26 (50.0)	18 (34.6)	**52**
	TOTAL	**11**	**28**	**12**	**31**	**18**	**100**
2	Private	24 (50.0)	21 (43.7)	3 (6.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	2 (3.8)	13 (25.0)	16 (30.8)	21 (40.2)	**52**
	TOTAL	**24**	**23**	**16**	**16**	**21**	**100**
3	Private	4 (8.3)	16 (33.3)	4 (8.3)	20 (41.8)	4 (8.3)	**48**
	Public	2 (3.8)	4 (7.7)	0 (0.0)	15 (28.8)	31 (59.6)	**52**
	TOTAL	**6**	**20**	**4**	**35**	**35**	**100**
4	Private	16 (33.3)	13 (27.1)	2 (4.2)	5 (10.4)	12 (25.0)	**48**
	Public	2 (3.8)	5 (9.6)	1 (1.9)	22 (42.3)	22 (42.3)	**52**
	TOTAL	**18**	**18**	**3**	**27**	**34**	**100**

SOURCE: Field Survey by Researcher, 2015. Compiled using SPSS version 20.0.

Note: Relative frequencies (%) are given in parenthesis and calculated against group totals (48 for private varsities, and 52 for public varsities).

Research Question One: Are there significant discrepancies between students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions in their perceptions of campus environment and physical infrastructure?

As shown above in table 4.3.1, students from private institutions hold divergent views from their counterparts in public institutions. As seen across all questions, while a larger number of students from private institutions have positive opinions about their campus environment and physical infrastructure, a larger number of students from public institutions have negative opinions about their campus environment and physical infrastructure.

For instance, in response to question 2 relating to the conduciveness of lecture halls, 45 students (93.7%) from private institutions responded positively, with only 3 students (6.3%) responding negatively. In contrast, only 2 students (3.8%) from public institutions responded positively, while 37 students (71.2%) responded negatively. As such, one can say that significant discrepancies exist between perceptions of students in private tertiary institutions and public tertiary institutions, with regards to their campus environment and physical infrastructure.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference between students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions in their perceptions of campus environment and physical infrastructure.

The t-values for questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 are obtainedfrom the responses above and used to test the hypothesis. The means, standard deviations (SD) and obtained t-valuesand their respective p-values (*P*) are shown in test statistics table 4.3.1 below.The significance level (α) is 0.05.

TEST STATISTICS TABLE 4.3.1

QS	SCHOOL	MEAN	SD	T-VALUE	*P*	α	REMARK
1	Private Public	3.8125 1.9231	0.91457 0.92559	10.257	0.000	0.05	Significant
2	Private Public	4.4375 1.9231	0.61562 0.90415	16.362	0.000	0.05	Significant
3	Private Public	2.9167 1.6731	1.19988 1.07960	5.432	0.000	0.05	Significant
4	Private Public	3.3333 1.9038	1.62864 1.08934	5.116	0.000	0.05	Significant

SOURCE: Author's Computation using SPSS 20.0, 2015.

From test statistics table 4.3.1, the p-values associated with the t-values all fall belowthe 5% significance level. As such, the difference in the perceptions of students on the various questions raised on campus environment and physical infrastructure is statisticallysignificant. As such, hypothesis one is rejected, leading us to conclude that there is asignificant difference between students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions in their perceptions of campus environment and physical infrastructure.

4.3.2 Analyzing Research Question Two and Hypothesis Two

Questions 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are used in the analysis of the second research question and hypothesis. These questions are related to classroom management and structure provided by the learning environment of public and private tertiary institutions. The frequency distribution of responses to the above questions as obtained and analyzed is presented in frequency table 4.3.2 below.

FREQUENCY TABLE 4.3.2

RESPONSES

QS	SCHOOL	SA	A	UN	D	SD	TOTAL
5	Private	0 (0.0)	8 (16.7)	12 (25.0)	19 (39.6)	9 (18.8)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	27 (52.0)	6 (11.5)	13 (25.0)	6 (11.5)	**52**
	TOTAL	**0**	**35**	**18**	**32**	**15**	**100**
6	Private	1 (2.1)	20 (41.7)	14 (29.1)	12 (25.0)	1 (2.1)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (11.5)	8 (15.4)	38 (73.1)	**52**
	TOTAL	**1**	**20**	**20**	**20**	**39**	**100**
7	Private	8 (16.7)	15 (31.3)	2 (4.1)	22 (45.8)	1 (2.1)	**48**
	Public	1 (2.0)	10 (19.2)	5 (9.6)	31 (59.6)	5 (9.6)	**52**
	TOTAL	**9**	**25**	**7**	**53**	**6**	**100**
8	Private	0 (0.0)	43 (89.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (11.4)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	3 (5.8)	17 (32.7)	18 (34.6)	14 (26.9)	**52**
	TOTAL	**0**	**46**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**100**
9	Private	8 (16.7)	31 (64.6)	7 (14.5)	1 (2.1)	1 (2.1)	**48**
	Public	5 (9.6)	7 (13.5)	1 (1.9)	9 (17.3)	30 (57.7)	**52**
	TOTAL	**13**	**38**	**8**	**10**	**31**	**100**

SOURCE: Field Survey by Researcher, 2015. Compiled using SPSS version 20.0.

Note: Relative frequencies (%) are given in parenthesis and calculated against group totals (48 for private varsities, and 52 for public varsities).

Research Question Two: Are there significant discrepancies in the way classroom management and structure provided by the learning environment are perceived by students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions?

From table 4.3.2, students from private institutions have different views from their counterparts in public institutions. As such, the positive responses of most students from private institutions stand in contrast to the negative responses of the larger proportion of students from public institutions on the relevant issues raised.

Using question 8 for instance, 43 students (89.6%) from private institutions responded positively that lecturers make an effort to ensure that classroom atmosphere is usually relaxed for meaningful learning during lectures, with only 5 (11.4%) of them not agreeing. Students from public tertiary institutions held contrary opinions as 32 (61.5%) of them either disagreed or stongly disagreed. Thus, the discrepancies in the way classroom management and structure provided by the learning environment is perceived by students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions can be said to be significant.

Hypothesis Two: There are no significant discrepancies in the way classroom management and structure provided by the learning environment is perceived by students in public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions.

The Independent T-test is carried out with the responses to questions 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The means, standard deviations (SD) and obtained t-valuesand their respective p-values (*P*) are shown in test statistics table 4.3.2 below. The significance level (α) is 0.05.

TEST STATISTICS TABLE 4.3.2

QS	SCHOOL	MEAN	SD	T-VALUE	*P*	A	REMARK
5	Private Public	2.3958 3.0385	0.98369 1.11955	-3.039	0.003	0.05	Significant
6	Private Public	3.1667 1.3846	0.90703 0.69038	10.987	0.000	0.05	Significant
7	Private Public	3.1458 2.4423	1.23753 0.97846	3.136	0.002	0.05	Significant
8	Private Public	3.6875 2.1731	0.92613 0.90144	8.284	0.000	0.05	Significant
9	Private Public	3.9167 2.0000	0.76724 1.42801	8.261	0.000	0.05	Significant

SOURCE: Author's Computation using SPSS 20.0, 2015.

For all the questions raised on this hypothesis, test statistics table 4.3.2 show that the p-values associated with the resulting t-values all fall below the 5% significance level. This implies that the difference in the perceptions of the two groups of students on the classroom management and structure provided by the learning environment in their respective institutions is statistically significant. Thus, hypothesis two is rejected.

4.3.3 Analyzing Research Question Three and Hypothesis Three

The relevant questions for the third research question and hypothesis are 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. These questions border on teacher-students relationship as a key component of the learning environment in learning institutions.Thefrequency distribution of responses to the above questions as obtained and analyzed is presented in frequency table 4.3.3 below.

FREQUENCY TABLE 4.3.3: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

QS	SCHOOL	SA	A	UN	D	SD	TOTAL
10	Private	19 (39.6)	15 (31.3)	12 (25.0)	2 (4.1)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	17 (32.7)	13 (25.0)	3 (5.8)	12 (23.0)	7 (13.5)	**52**
	TOTAL	**36**	**28**	**15**	**14**	**7**	**100**
11	Private	14 (29.2)	29 (60.4)	4 (8.3)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	10 (19.2)	3 (5.8)	23 (44.2)	16 (30.8)	**52**
	TOTAL	**14**	**39**	**7**	**24**	**16**	**100**
12	Private	21 (43.7)	14 (29.2)	1 (2.1)	11 (22.9)	1 (2.1)	**48**

	Public	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (7.7)	16 (30.8)	32 (61.5)	**52**
	TOTAL	**21**	**14**	**5**	**27**	**33**	**100**
13	Private	20 (41.7)	12 (25.0)	1 (2.1)	15 (31.2)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	10 (19.2)	25 (48.1)	8 (15.4)	3 (5.8)	6 (11.5)	**52**
	TOTAL	**30**	**37**	**9**	**18**	**6**	**100**
14	Private	4 (8.3)	23 (47.9)	10 (20.8)	6 (12.5)	5 (10.5)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	13 (25.0)	1 (1.9)	26 (50.0)	12 (23.1)	**52**
	TOTAL	**4**	**36**	**11**	**32**	**17**	**100**

SOURCE: Field Survey by Researcher, 2015. Compiled using SPSS version 20.0.

Note: Relative frequencies (%) are given in parenthesis and calculated against group totals (48 for private varsities, and 52 for public varsities).

Research Question Three: Is there a significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the teacher-students relationship as a component of the learning environment?

Frequency table 4.3.3 show that a significant number of positive responses are recorded for students in private institutions, which is in contrast to the significant number of negative responses recorded for students in public institutions on all relevant questions, except for question 13. Overall, the significant difference in responses between both student groups for majority of the questions (10, 11, 12, 14) attests to the significant difference in perceptions between both student groups as regards to teacher-students relationship in their respective institutions.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the teacher-students relationship as a component of the learning environment.

From the above responses to questions 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, the Independent T-test is carried out to test the hypothesis. The means, standard deviations (SD) and obtained t-valuesand their respective p-values (*P*) are shown in test statistics table 4.3.3 below. The significance level (α) is 0.05.

TEST STATISTICS TABLE 4.3.3

QS	SCHOOL	MEAN	SD	T-VALUE	*P*	A	REMARK
10	Private	4.0625	0.90873	2.648	0.009	0.05	Significant
	Public	3.4038	1.48535				
11	Private	4.1667	0.66311	11.327	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.1346	1.06695				
12	Private	3.8958	1.25883	12.326	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	1.4615	0.64051				
13	Private	3.7708	1.29220	0.773	0.442	0.05	Insignificant
	Public	3.5769	1.21019				
14	Private	3.3125	1.13280	4.597	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.2885	1.09072				

SOURCE: Author's Computation using SPSS 20.0, 2015.

The test statistics table 4.3.3 shows that the differences in opinions of the two student groups on the questions raised on this hypothesis are statistically significant, with the exception of question 13. As such, there is no significant difference in the opinions of students from both groups on whether lecturers view students as deliberately non-compliant and as such treat students harshly. Nonetheless, hypothesis three is rejected on the basis of the statistically significant difference in opinions of both student groups on other relevant questions raised on the hypothesis.

4.3.4 Analyzing Research Question Four and Hypothesis Four

Responses to questions 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 are used in the analysis of the fourth research question and hypothesis, as they are related to the quality of instructional procedure and materials. The frequency distribution of responses to the above questions as obtained and analyzed is presented in frequency table 4.3.4 below.

FREQUENCY TABLE 4.3.4: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

QS	SCHOOL	SA	A	UN	D	SD	TOTAL
15	Private	22 (45.8)	15 (31.3)	0 (0.0)	11 (22.9)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	1 (1.9)	7 (13.4)	24 (46.2)	20 (38.5)	**52**
	TOTAL	**11**	**28**	**12**	**31**	**18**	**100**
16	Private	25 (52.1)	17 (35.4)	6 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	4 (7.7)	2 (3.8)	15 (28.8)	31 (59.6)	**52**
	TOTAL	**24**	**23**	**16**	**16**	**21**	**100**
17	Private	16 (33.3)	21 (43.8)	2 (4.2)	6 (12.5)	3 (6.2)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	12 (23.1)	2 (3.8)	16 (30.8)	22 (42.3)	**52**
	TOTAL	**16**	**33**	**4**	**22**	**25**	**100**
18	Private	12 (25.0)	22 (45.8)	14 (29.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	3 (5.8)	7 (13.5)	1 (1.9)	8(15.4)	33 (63.4)	**52**
	TOTAL	**15**	**29**	**15**	**8**	**33**	**100**
19	Private	17 (35.4)	27 (56.3)	4 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	9 (17.3)	2 (3.8)	19 (36.5)	22 (28.9)	7 (13.5)	**52**
	TOTAL	**26**	**29**	**23**	**22**	**7**	**100**

SOURCE: Field Survey by Researcher, 2015. Compiled using SPSS version 20.0.

Note: Relative frequencies (%) are given in parenthesis and calculated against group totals (48 for private varsities, and 52 for public varsities).

Research Question Four: Is there a significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials as components of the learning environment?

The frequency table 4.3.4 shows marked differences in the perception of both students groups. For all the relevant questions, the positive opinions about the quality of instructional procedure and materials held by private institutions students stood in contrast to negative opinions held by public institution students on the subject matter.

For instance, 42 students (87.5%) from private institutions either agreed or strongly agreed that instructional procedures in my undergraduate programme involve an adequate use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the teaching-learning process. Conversely, 46 students (88.5%) from public institutions either disagreed or strongly disagreed to the adequacy of ICTs-integration in their learning process. Thus, one can say that the difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials is significant.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials as components of the learning environment.

The responses above in frequency table 4.3.4 are used to obtaint-values for questions 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19and used to test the hypothesis. The means, standard

deviations (SD) and obtained t-values and their respective p-values (*P*) are shown in test statistics table 4.3.1 below. The significance level (α) is 0.05.

TEST STATISTICS TABLE 4.3.4

QS	SCHOOL	MEAN	SD	T-VALUE	*P*	α	REMARK
15	Private	4.000	1.18501	11.048	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	1.7885	0.74981				
16	Private	4.3958	0.70679	17.308	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	1.5962	0.89134				
17	Private	3.8542	1.20265	7.438	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.0769	1.18564				
18	Private	3.9583	0.74258	10.108	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	1.8269	1.30941				
19	Private	4.2708	0.60983	7.436	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.8269	1. 24808				

SOURCE: Author's Computation using SPSS 20.0, 2015.

From test statistics table 4.3.4, all the p-values accompanying the obtained t-values fall below the 5% significance level. As such, hypothesis fthe is rejected, leading us to conclude that there is a significant difference between public and private institution students in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials as components of the learning environment.

4.3.5 Analyzing Research Question Five and Hypothesis Five

For analysis of the fifth research question and hypothesis, responses to questions 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are used. These questions relate to the impact of learning environment on student motivation and engagement, as viewed by students from private and public tertiary institutions. The frequency distribution of responses to the above questions as obtained and analyzed is presented in frequency table 4.3.5 below.

FREQUENCY TABLE 4.3.5

RESPONSES

QS	SCHOOL	SA	A	UN	D	SD	TOTAL
20	Private	21 (43.8)	19 (39.6)	8 (16.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (9.6)	23 (44.2)	24 (46.2)	**52**
	TOTAL	**21**	**19**	**13**	**23**	**24**	**100**
21	Private	9 (18.8)	37 (77.1)	2 (4.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	1 (1.9)	8 (15.4)	28 (53.9)	10 (19.2)	5 (9.6)	**52**
	TOTAL	**10**	**45**	**30**	**10**	**5**	**100**
22	Private	19 (39.6)	29 (60.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	2 (3.8)	21 (40.4)	20 (38.5)	9 (17.3)	**52**
	TOTAL	**6**	**20**	**4**	**35**	**35**	**100**
23	Private	20 (41.6)	21 (43.8)	1 (2.1)	6 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	**48**
	Public	0 (0.0)	8 (15.4)	13 (25.0)	26 (50.0)	5 (9.6)	**52**
	TOTAL	**20**	**29**	**14**	**32**	**5**	**100**
24	Private	10 (20.8)	25 (52.1)	3 (6.3)	10 (20.8)	0 (0.0)	**48**

	Public	1 (1.9)	6 (11.5)	7 (13.5)	22 (42.3)	16 (30.8)	**52**
	TOTAL	**11**	**31**	**10**	**32**	**16**	**100**

SOURCE: Field Survey by Researcher, 2015. Compiled using SPSS version 20.0.

Note: Relative frequencies (%) are given in parenthesis and calculated against group totals (48 for private varsities, and 52 for public varsities).

Research Question Five: Is there a significant difference in the perception of students on the impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and desire to learn in public and private institutions of higher learning?

Frequency table 4.3.5 above shows markedly different perceptions between students from private institutions and their counterparts in public institutions. As seen for all the questions, largely positive responses on the part of private school students stand in sharp contrast to largely negative responses on the part of public school students. As such, one can say that significant discrepancies exist between perceptions of students in private tertiary institutions and public tertiary institutions, with regards to their campus environment and physical infrastructure.

Hypothesis Five: There is no significant difference in the perception of students on the impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and desire to learn in public and private institutions of higher learning.

The t-values for questions 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are obtainedfrom the responses above and used to test the hypothesis. The means, standard deviations (SD) and obtained t-valuesand their respective p-values (*P*) are shown in test statistics table 4.3.1 below. The significance level (α) is 0.05.

TEST STATISTICS TABLE 4.3.5

QS	SCHOOL	MEAN	SD	T-VALUE	*P*	α	REMARK
20	Private	4.2708	0.73768	18.910	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	1.6346	0.65765				
21	Private	4.1458	0.46076	9.574	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.8077	0.88647				
22	Private	4.3958	0.49420	15.785	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.3077	0.80534				
23	Private	4.1456	0.96733	9.149	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.4615	0.87361				
24	Private	3.7292	1.02604	7.802	0.000	0.05	Significant
	Public	2.1154	1.04138				

SOURCE: Author's Computation using SPSS 20.0, 2015.

From test statistics table 4.3.5, the p-values of the obtained t-values all fall below the 5% significance level for all the questions. Thus, differences in responses from both student groups on relevant questions raised on the hypothesis are statistically significant. As such, hypothesis five is rejected, leading us to conclude that there is a significant difference in the perception of students on the impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and desire to learn in public and private institutions of higher learning.

4.4 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

On the basis of the analysis of the research questions and hypotheses, several findings are made on the perceptions of students from private and public tertiary institutions about their learning environment in their respective institutions. These findings are discussed here.

Results from this study show that perceptions of campus environment and physical infrastructure by students in private tertiary institutions and students in public tertiary institutions are markedly different. In this regard, students from both groups have significantly different perceptions of their campus environment, conduciveness of lecture halls, student spaces (hostels and recreational facilities), and growth of student population and accompanying growth of physical infrastructure (hostels, lecture halls and libraries). While students in private tertiary institutions are more favorably disposed towards their

campus environment in terms of functionality of lecture halls and student spaces, the reverse was the case for students in public tertiary institutions.

Classroom management and structure in both public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions was also perceived differently by students attending these institutions. From the analysis, it was found that perceptions between both student groups of management style of lecturers, levels of disruption during lectures, classroom atmosphere and lecturers' use of teaching aids were significantly different. As such, relatively more students in private tertiary institutions perceived the management style of their lecturers to be more participatory than autocratic. In contrast, students in public tertiary institutions either disagreed or strongly disagreed to the above. Another point in case is that students in private tertiary institutions perceive their lecturers as being more involved in the improvement student performance. Conversely, students in public tertiary institutions either disagreed or strongly disagreed to the above perception.

Perceptions of teacher-students relationship was also found to be different between students from both institutions, but not markedly as for the above two hypotheses as shown relatively smaller t-value for question 10, and insignificant t-value for question 13. Nonetheless, student groups differ in their perceptions of mutual respect between lecturers and students, academic mentorship or leadership as provided by lecturers, lecturer personality, and working with lecturers to improve lecturer-student

relationship. However, there was no significant difference between both student groups in their perception of the tendency of lecturers to treat students harshly, as a result of lecturers'view students as deliberately non-compliant.

Both student groups were found to differ significantly in their perceptions of the quality of instructional procedure and materials in their respective institutions. In this regard, both groups were markedly different in their perceptions of approachability and accessibility of staffs, use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the teaching-learning process, the relevance of instructional procedures and materials to academic challenges and workload, as well asthe appropriateness and fairness of assessment and evaluation methods (assignments, tests, exams, and grading).

Finally, the most significant difference was shown to exist between the perceptions of both student groups on the impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and engagement, as shown by the higher t-values obtained for the relevant questions. Thus, students from private institutions perceived better support of their academics, stimulated interest in cthese contents, and intellectual appreciation of the ctheses they offer. Responses from the students in public tertiary institutions stood in sharp contrast to the perceptions of their counterparts in private institutions, as their perception the learning environment in public tertiary institutions can be described as demoralizing and having an adverse impact on student motivation and engagement.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the summary of findings are presented, policy recommendations are made and conclusion for the study is made.

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This research work comparatively assessed the perceptions of students from public and private tertiary institutions about their learning environment. Using the Independent Samples T-test, responses from students of public and private institutions were analyzed. The empirical results of the analysis can be summarized as the following findings:

1. Perceptions of campus environment and physical infrastructure by students in private tertiary institutions and students in public tertiary institutions are markedly different.
2. Classroom management and structure in both public tertiary institutions and private tertiary institutions are perceived differently by students attending these institutions.

3. Both student groups differ in their perceptions of lecturer-student relationship in their respective schools.
4. There is a significant difference in perception of the quality of instructional procedure and materials between students from private tertiary institutions and their counterparts in public tertiary institutions.
5. Students from public tertiary institutions and their counterparts in private tertiary institutions differ in their perception of impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and engagement.

5.3 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the research findings that indicate huge disparities between public and private tertiary institutions in the country, the following recommendations are made:

1. Explicit benchmarks on good quality of campus environment and physical infrastructure should be developed and statutorily enforced in all tertiary institutions in the country. This will ensure a basic level of quality of campus environments and physical infrastructures across all schools, thereby reducing the disparities in perceptions of students attending these institutions.
2. Exchange programs between public and private institutions within same geographical area should be developed, as a way to integrate students from both

institutions. Experiences by students during the duration of such programs will considerably harmonize the views of both student groups overtime.

3. Value orientation programmes and reforms should be organised nationwide for lecturers, promoting the idea that higher education institutions are essentially service providers, with lecturers as the customer service providers and students as the customers. The focus should be on customers' satisfaction. This will relatively improve how lecturers relate with students, and consequently lecturer-student relationships in both private and public institutions.
4. In view of the infrastructural inadequacies of tertiary learning institutions, especially in the public schools, capital investments should be increased to provide serene campus environments befitting of audit learning environment, adequate and spacious lecture halls with functional public address systems, as well as habitable accommodation hostels.
5. A basic standard of classroom management and structure should be adopted by tertiary learning institutions to reduce disparities in service delivery between public and private tertiary learning institutions in Nigeria.
6. Efforts should be made to ensure that instructional materials and procedures are both updated, and feature adequate levels of ICT-integration, in both public and private universities.

7. In view of the population explosion in most public higher learning institutions, efforts should be made to establish more, so as to decongest existing ones and ensure adequate availability of infrastructure to facilitate meaningful learning.

5.4 CONCLUSION

This study has provided insights into the discrepancies between student perceptions of their learning environment. Review of relevant literature and our empirical analysis has shown that perceptions of learning environment differ significantly between students from public institutions of higher learning, and students from private institutions of higher learning. As such, between both student groups, they have different perceptions of several components of the learning environment.

Campus environment and physical infrastructure, classroom management and structure, lecturer-student relationship, quality of instructional procedure and materials, and impact of the learning environment on students' motivation and engagement, are the components learning environment perceived differently by students in private tertiary institutions and students in public tertiary institutions.

In view of such wide disparities in the perceptions of the student groups, it was mainly recommended that benchmarks on good quality of campus environment and physical infrastructure, as well as classroom management and structure should be

developed and statutorily enforced, in order to close the huge gaps in service delivery between private and public institutions in the country. Also, with the aim of improving lecturer-student relationships in both private and public institutions, countrywide value orientation programmes and reforms should be organised for lecturers, to re-focus education delivery at the tertiary level on customers' satisfaction, where lecturers are the customer service providers and students as the customers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, R., Ramnarayan, K., Vinod, P., & Torke, S. (2008). Students' perceptions of learning environment in an Indian medical school.*BMC Medical Education, 8*(20), 1-5.

Adler, R. W., Milne, M. J., & Stablein, R. (2011). Situated motivation: An empirical test in an accounting course. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 18*, 101-115.

Adunola, O. (2011). *The impact of teachers' teaching methods on the academic performance of primary school in pupils in Ijebu-Ode Local Government of Ogun State*. Ogun State: EgoBooster Books.

Aggarwal, J. C. (2006). *Teacher and education in a developing society*. New Delhi, India: Vikas Publishing House.

Ajayi, A. I., Ekundayo, T. H., & Osalusi, F. M. (2010). Learning environment and secondary school effectiveness in Nigeria. *Studies on Home and Community Science, 4*(3), 137-142.

Akpan, G. E. (1998). The effect of student income support on academic performance. *The Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies, 40*(2), 285-293.

Akporehe, A. D. (2012). The impact of environment on productivity in secondary schools. *African Journal of Education and Technology, 1*(1), 116-122.

Alabi A. T., Oduwaiye, R. O., & Fasasi, Y. A. Learning environment in Nigerian primary school: Challenges to educational administrators. *Journal of Educational Research and Development, 7*(1), 1-14.

APA Work Group of the Board of Educational Affairs (1997). *Learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for school reform and redesign* (Rev. Ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Arul, L. A. S., & Vimala, A. (2012). School environment and academic achievement of standard IX students. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World, 2*(3), 210-215.

Buyse, E., Verschueren, K., Verachtert, P., & Van Damme, J. (2009). Predicting school adjustment in early elementary school: Impact of teacher-child relationship

quality and relational classroom climate. *Elementary School Journal, 110*(2), 119-141.

Chandler, K., Nolin, M. J., & Zill, N. (1993). *Parents and students perception of the learning environment at school.* Washington, D.C., USA: National Center for Education Statistics.

Chang, Y. (2010). *Students' perceptions of teaching styles and use of learning strategies.* (Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA).

Den Brok, P., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2006). Multilevel issues in research using students' perceptions of learning environments: The case of the questionnaire on teacher interaction. *Learning Environments Research, 9*(3), 199–213.

Denscombe, M. (2003).*The Good Research Guide for Small-scale Social Research Projects*, (2nd Ed.). Philadelphia: Open University Press Maidenhead-.

Doppelt, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). Identifying students' perceptions of the important classroom features affecting learning aspects of a design-based learning environment. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10*, 225–235.

Duruji, M. M., Azuh, D., & Oviasogie, F. A. (2013, July). *Learning environment and academic performance of secondary school students in external examinations: A study of selected schools in Ota.* Proceedings of EDULEARN14 Conference, Barcelona, Spain.

Earthman, G. I. (2004). Prioritization of 31 Criteria for School Building Adequacy. Retrieved from http://www.aclumd.org/aTop%20Issues/Education%20Reform/EarthmanFinal10504.pdf.

Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist, 36*(2), 103-112.

Entwistle, N. J. (1991). Approaches to learning and perceptions of the learning environment. Introduction to the special issue. *Higher Education, 22*, 201-204.

Federal Government of Nigeria. (2006). *Federal Government approved guidelines for accessing and utilization of the Federal Government of Nigeria Universal Basic Education (UBE) intervention fund.* Abuja: Universal Basic Education Commission.

Frenzel, A. C., Pekrun, R., & Goetz, T. (2007). Perceived learning environment and students' emotional experiences: A multilevel analysis of mathematics classrooms. *Learning and Instruction, 17,* 478-493.

Fubara, B. A., & Mguni, B. S. (1995) *Research Methods in Management.* London: Minerva Press.

Greatz, K. A. (2006). The psychology of learning environments. In D. G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 6.12-6.13). Louisville, USA: Educause.

Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher–child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development, 72,* 625–638.

Hanrahan, M. (1998). The effect of learning environment factors on students' motivation and learning. *International Journal of Science Education, 20*(6), 737-753.

Hartnett, M., St. George, A., & Dron, J. (2011) Examining motivation in online distance learning environments: Complex, multifaceted, and situation-dependent. *International Review of Research on Open and Distance Learning, 12*(6), 21-38.

Higgins, S., Hall, E., Wall, K., Woolner, P., & McCaughey, C. (2005). *The impact of school environments: A literature review.* United Kingdom: CfBT Research and Development.

Hughes, J. N., & Chen, Q. (2011). Reciprocal effects of student–teacher and student peer relatedness: Effects on academic self efficacy. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 32*(5), 278–287.

Idogho, P. O. (2011). Higher education in Nigeria and the challenges ahead. *European Journal of Education, 3*(2), 269-276.

Ikitde, A. G., & Edet, B. U. (2013). Influence of learning styles and teaching strategies on students' achievement in Biology. *Voice of Research, 1*(4), 5-13.

Instructional Procedure. (2010). In the Great Russian Encyclopedia Online. Retrieved from http://classroom.synonym.com/cite-online-encyclopedia-apa-format-1293.html.

Jacobs, K. (2009, October). *An act relative to the consideration of ergonomically designed school buildings.* House Bill No 443 presented as part of the General Court of Massachusetts public hearing of the Joint Committee on Education, Massachusetts.

Kagoda, M. A. (2011). The influence of the schools learning environment on the performance of teacher trainees on school practice - A case of the School of Education, Makerere University, Uganda. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences 3*(3), 244-252.

Khaldi, A., & Khatib, A. (2014). Students' perception of the learning environment in business education in Kuwait: A comparative study between private and public universities. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 5*(3), 59-68.

Kimani, W. S., Kagira, K. E., & Kendi, L. (2011). Comparative analysis of business students' perceptions of service quality offered in Kenyan Universities. *International Journal of Business Administration, 2*(1), 98-112.

Kinzie, J. (2010). Student engagement and learning: Experiences that matter. In J. Christensen Hughes & J. Mighty (Eds.), *Taking stock: Research on teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 139-154). Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen"s University. Press.

Kizlik, B. (2015). *Instructional methods information-Part 1.* Retrieved from http://www.adprima.com/teachmeth.htm.

Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273.

Knoell, M. C. (2012). *The role of the student-teacher relationship in the lives of fifth graders: A mixed methods analysis.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, USA).

Lee, C. J., Yin, H., & Zhang, Z. (2009). Exploring the influence of the classroom environment on students' motivation and self-regulated learning in Hong Kong. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 18*(2), 219-232.

Lee, S. J. (2007). The relations between the student-teacher trust relationship and school success in the case of Korean middle schools. *Educational Studies, 33*(2), 209-216.

Liberante, L. (2012). The importance of teacher–student relationships, as explored through the lens of the NSW Quality Teaching Model. *Journal of Student Engagement: Education Matters, 2*(1), 2–9.

Lizzio, A., Wilson, K., & Simons, R. (2002). University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 27*(1), 28-52.

Ludtke, O., Robitzsch, A., Trautwein, U., & Kunter, M. (2009).Assessing the impact of learning environments: How to use student ratings of classroom or school characteristics in multilevel modeling.*Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34,* 120-131.

Marzano, J. R., Marzano, S. J., & Pickering, J. D. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher.* Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mortagy, Y., & Boghikian-Whitby, S. (2010). A longitudinal comparative study of student perceptions in online education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects, 6*, 23-44.

Ndukwe, P. N. (2002). *School and teacher factors as determinants of classroom material resources utilization in pre-primary schools in Lagos State.* (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria).

Nwike, C. M., & Onyejegbu, C. (2013). Effects of use of instructional materials on students cognitive achievement in Agricultural Science. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 3*(5), 103-107.

Oaikhenan, H. E., & Udegbunam, R. I. (2004).*Modern statistics for economics and business.* Benin City: H. Henas Publishers.

O'Bannon, B. (2002). What are instructional methods? *Planning for Instruction.* Retrieved from http://edtech2.tennessee.edu/projects/bobannon/in_strategies.html.

Obomanu, H. L. (2011, December). *The Nigerian learners: Past, present and future.* Paper presented at the 2011 International Conference on Teaching, Learning and Change, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

Odundo A. P., & Gunga, O. S. (2013). Effect of application of instructional methods on learner achievement in Business Studies. *International Journal of Education and Research, 1*(5), 1-22.

Office of Early Childhood Development. (2008). *Competencies for early childhood professionals.* Virginia, USA: Author, Virginia Department of Social Services.

Ogbeda, A. J., & Mukulu, I. A. (2013). Influence of clean school environment and standard class room size and facilities on students' achievement in Biology in Gwagwalada Area Council of Fct-Abuja. *Case Studies Journal, August*, 21-26.

Ogu, E. (2008, September 20). Challenges facing Nigerian universities. *NigeriaWorld*. Retrieved from http://nigeriaworld.com/articles/2008/sep/300.html.

Ojogwu, C. N., & Alutu, A. N. G. (2009). Analysis of the learning environment of university students on Nigeria: A case study of University of Benin. *Journal of Social Sciences, 19*(1), 69-73.

Okoza, J., Aluede, O., & Akpaida E. A. J. (2012). Secondary school students perception of environmental variables influencing academic performance in Edo State, Nigeria. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology, 9*(2), 84-94.

Okpala, P. (2000). *Researching learning outcomes at the basic education level in Nigeria*. Paper presented at Inaugural Lecture of the University of Nigeria, Nssuka, Enugu, Nigeria.

Oladejo, A. M., Olosunde, R. G., Ojebisi, O. A., & Isola, M. O. (2011). Instructional materials and students' academic achievement in Physics: Some policy implications. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*(1), 112-126.

Olaleye, O. F. (2012). Creating a friendly school learning environment for Nigerian children. *European Scientific Journal, 8*(8), 138-147.

Olorunfemi-Olabisi, A. F. (2013). Students' perception of teachers' factors in the teaching and learning of English Language in Nigerian secondary schools. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 3*(3), 173-179.

Olosunde, G. R., & Akinpelu, S. O. (2012). Classroom physical environment, teaching materials, teacher's technical skills and learning outcomes in secondary school mathematics in Nigeria. *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 16*(1), 821-830.

Omomia, O. A., & Omomia, T. A. (2014). Perceived impact of classroom management on effective teaching: A study of five schools in Education District 11, Lagos State, Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 10*(22), 309-312.

Onyekakeyah, L. (2005, September 20). University education and challenges. *The Guardian Newspaper*, p. 20.

Osakinle, E. O. Onijigin, E. O. & Falana, B. A. (2010). Teaching methods and learners' environment in a Nigerian university. *African Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 2*(1-2), 7-10.

Partnership for 21st Century Learning. (2008). *21st century learning environments.* Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/storage/documents/le_white_paper-1.pdf.

Paswan, K. A., & Young, J. A. (2002). Student evaluation of instructor: A nomological investigation using structural equation modeling. *Journal of Marketing Education, 24*(3), 193–202.

Perception. (2006). In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (7th ed,). Great Clarendon, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Perception. (2015). In Livio English Dictionary. Retrieved from http://wikitionary.org.

Phillips, R. A., McNaught, C., & Kennedy, G. (2010). Towards a generalised conceptual framework for learning: The learning environment, learning processes and learning outcomes (LEPO) framework. In J. Herrington & W. Hunter (Eds.), *ED-MEDIA 2010* (pp. 2495-2504). Chesapeake VA: Association for the Advancement of Computers in Education.

PricewaterhouseCoopers (2001). *Building performance: An empirical analysis of the relationship between schools' capital investment and pupil performance.* United Kingdom: Department for Education and Employment.

Randhawa, B. S., & Michayluk, J. O. (1974).*Learning environment in rural and urban classrooms.Research report.* Saskatoon, Canada: Educational Research Resources Center of University of Saskatchewan.

Salami, J. (2001). Tertiary education in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Higher Education Management, 13*(2), 105-129.

Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis P., & Thornhill, A. (2007).*Research Methods for Business Students,* (4th ed). FT Prentice Hall.

Schneider, M. (2002). *Do school facilities affect academic outcomes?* Washington DC. USA: National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities.

Soyombo, O. (2002) "Techniques of Data Collection, Questionnaire Design and Administration" in A. R. Anao and C. U. Uche (eds) *Research Design and Implementation in Accounting and Finance.* Benin and Lagos: University of Benin Press and ICAN.

Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2005). Students' perceptions about evaluation and assessment in higher education: A review. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(4), 331–347.

Tsavga, J. (2011). *The effect of environment on the academic performance of students in Tarka Local Government Area of Benue State.* (Unpublished PGDE Thesis, Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria).

Ubong, B. (2007). *Hostel accommodation in tertiary educational institutions in Nigeria: To be or not to be.* Retrieved from http://www.basseyubong.com/HOSTEL%20ACCOMMODATION.pdf.

Udoh, A. O. (2012). Learning environment as correlates of chemistry students' achievement in secondary schools in Akwa-Ibom State of Nigeria. *An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia, 6*(3), 208-217.

Victorian Institute of Teaching. (2007). *The effect of the physical learning environment on teaching and learning. Research Discussion.* Retrieved from http://www.vit.vic.edu.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/PDF/1137_The-Effect-of-the-Physical-Learning-Environment-on-Teaching-and-Learning.pdf

Wei, L. S., & Elias, H. (2011). Relationship between students' perceptions of classroom environment and their motivation in learning english language. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1*(21), 241-250.

Wierstra, F. A. R., Kanselaar, G., Van Der Linden, L. J., & Lodewijks, H. (1999). Learning environment perceptions of European students. Learning *Environments Research, 2*, 79–98.

Williams, C. K., & Williams, C. C. (2011). Five key ingredients for improving student motivation. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 12*(August), 1- 23.

Xu, H. (2011). Students' perception of university education - USA vs China. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 10*(March), 1-10.

Young, R. M. (2005). The motivational effects of the classroom environment in facilitating self-regulated learning. *Journal of Marketing Education, 27*(1), 25-40.

Zhu, C., Valcke, M., Schellens, T., & Li, Y. (2009). Chinese students' perceptions of a collaborative e-learning environment and factors affecting their performance: Implementing a Flemish e-learning course in a Chinese educational context. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10,* 22

Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Benin, Benin City,
Edo State

July, 2015.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent,

I am a final year student of the above named department in the University of Benin, Edo State. I am carrying out a research project on the topic: **STUDENTS'PERCEPTION OF LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN EDO STATE.**

This is a public survey questionnaire which is aimed at identifying and collecting data about what views undergraduate students have about their school environment as anenvironment where theylearn.

While this is a comparative study, it is mainly for academic purposes. Thus, your kind and objective response to the questions is highly solicited. Please I implore you to read instructions and questions thoroughly.

Please be assured that your responses will be treated confidentially and used only for this research. I kindly solicit your understanding and cooperation.

ANITA ALANEME

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

INSTRUCTION: Please tick in the space [ ] or write down when required.

1. **Name of School:**

2. **Faculty**
   Medicine [ ] Other Sciences [ ] Law[ ] Engineering[ ] Social Sciences [ ] Management Sciences [ ]

3. **Sex**
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

4. **Age**
   16-20 years [ ] 21- 25 years [ ] 26- 30 years [ ] 31 + years [ ]

SECTION B: YOUR VIEWS ON YOUR LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

INSTRUCTION: Please tick your response as appropriately as possible.

SA: Strongly Agree. A: Agree. UN: Undecided. D: Disagree. SD: Strongly Disagree.

1.	The campus environment (size, greenspace, building designs and layout) of my school provides an additional satisfaction and prestige from my undergraduate programme.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
2.	Lecture halls in my school are conducive for learning in terms of being spacious, well ventilated and having functional public address systems.					
3.	Student spaces (hostels and recreational facilities) in my school that provide relaxation from academic work are adequate.					
4.	The growth of student population in my school has been accompanied by adequate growth of physical infrastructure (hostels, lecture halls and libraries).					
5.	The management style of most of my lecturers during lectures is more autocratic than participatory.					
6.	My course lecturers control and monitor students progress in their courses, so as to improve student performance.					
7.	Lectures in my school usually suffer from a high level of disruptive behaviour and distraction from fellow students.					
8.	My lecturers make an effort to ensure that classroom atmosphere is usually relaxed for meaningful learning during lectures.					
9.	My course lecturers usually employ teaching aids during lectures to					

	promote a deep understanding of course contents by students.					
10.	Lecturers having mutual respect for and good rapport with students elicit more student cooperation and engagement.					
11.	The relationship between my lecturers and I give me a form of academic mentorship or leadership.					
12.	The personality of my lecturers during lectures and non-lecture periods encourages me to work harder at his or her course.					
13.	Lecturers tend to view students as deliberately non-compliant and as such, are apt to treat students harshly.					
14.	I will appreciate a scheme that allows me work together with a lecturer on a course-related project in order to improve lecturer-student relationship.					
15.	I'm comfortable with my school's administration as it features approachable and accessible staffs that makes administrative work easier and less stressful.					
16.	The instructional procedures in my undergraduate programme involves an adequate use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the teaching-learning process.					
17.	In view of my academic challenges and workload, the instructional procedures and materials provides adequate help and feedback.					
18.	My undergraduate programme features an adequate level of course instructors' responsiveness to students' academic concerns and challenges.					
19.	The assessment and evaluation methods (assignments, tests, exams, and grading) adopted in my undergraduate programme are appropriate and fair.					
20.	My expectations of moderate or high academic achievement have been enhanced by my school environment.					
21.	My undergraduate programme takes place in a learning environment that fosters the intellectual appreciation of the course I offer.					
22.	My undergraduate programme is organized in a way that encourages me to take responsibility for my learning.					
23.	My undergraduate programme is organized in a way that stimulates my interest in what I'm being taught.					
24.	My undergraduate programme takes place in a learning environment that provides an adequate level of academic challenge and realistic workload.					