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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The chapter introduces culture, cultural landscape development and how it has been pioneered by the geographers. This thus shaped the paradigm of thoughts and studies which were based more on the tangible aspects of cultural landscape without much attention given to the intangible aspects. It further showed that the few studies carried out on the intangible cultural landscape have been on the western concepts and thus concluded on the need for such studies to be carried out in Africa and to be more specific the Nupe Ethnic community of Nigeria.

1.2 Background of the research

Culture involves social interaction, endless history of social interaction and the analysis of the community’s exposure (De Aranzabal et al., 2008; Flinn, 1997; Linehan and Gross, 1998; Risjord, 2007). Culture is also the collective perspective and a way of living of members of a given community, (Palang et al., 2011; Woodside et al., 2011). It is also considered as a complex web of beliefs, and values coming from different people within a community, (Marcucci 2000). The communal interaction is thus not limited to the people but it extends to the landscape. This communal living is established within a given landscape which is characterised with man- made features and Natural features, (Appleton 1975) for the day to day sustenance of man. Cultural interactions are premised within different landscapes which are subject to different interpretations based on the scale of coverage.

The pioneers of landscape studies were the geographers and the focus of the early studies, was mostly on the tangible and biophysical aspects of the landscape. The development of rural landscape by geographers were structural and
archaeological (Claval, 2005). It is termed structural, because the emphases were more on the shape of the landscape and archaeological remains. The studies were also based on observed features of the past history of landscapes. This is also what is reflected in the recent research of Ina Gavra (2012).

The African continent which is the first hub of human settlement has had little cultural landscape studies directed at it even though it is a continent with rich cultural heritage. For instance Nigeria with a population of over 160 million people (NPC, 2010), has over 250 ethnic groups. Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo ethnic groups are considered the most populous and thus, they have enjoyed most of government policy formulations on culture. The empathy of academic research within Nigerian context has also been more on the three ethnic groups of Hausa Yoruba and Igbo, (Adegbija, 2004).

The Nupe ethnic group is amongst the second tier of major ethnic group in Nigeria as asserted by Adegbija, (2004). This is also highlighted by the Expanded Graded Inter-Generational Disruption Scale (EGIDS) of ethnic languages, which measures the level of development or endangerment, with 0 being the highest level of homogeneity and 10 being the highest level of endangerment (Figure 1). The Nupe ethnic group with a population of over one million is graded 3 on the scale and represented in the figure in a bigger purple dot (Lewis and Simons, 2010). The Nupe ethnic group’s endangerment risk of extinction is low.
It however lacks literary works for the sustenance of the language and culture. One of the few works on Nupe literature is the Bible which was due to the missionary activities in the early nineteen century. Language however plays an important role in the preservation of cultural norms, beliefs, identity, communication and interaction within the landscape. Language has a strong tie with landscape interpretation and meaning, for example the term “takogi” in Nupe Community of Doko refers to a settlement in the lowest part of the landscape (valley). A whole compound or community name could portray the profession of the people, this is seen in some Nupe communities of Bida and Doko where tswata refers to as the blackssmiths compound. Nupe communities are therefore rich with vocabularies that describe landscape and their meanings.

However the Nupe ethnic group which is laden with so many lingual vocabularies in the description of its landscape has only the work of Nadel (1942), anthropological study in the literature. The study focused mainly on the political and economic organisation of the Nupe people. Nupe cultural landscape and values associated with the spaces were not covered in the studies. His studies however mentioned the rich cultural heritage and the conglomeration of rich landscapes within the Nupe communities.

Nupe communities are situated within the middle belt region of Nigeria as illustrated in Figures 2 and 3. It is thus characterised with rich rainforest vegetation found in the southernmost part of the country and also the savannah vegetation of the North. Nupe communities are also found within the landscape boundaries of River Niger where some settlements could be found along the river corridors. Nupe communities are thus characterised with different settlement types of riverine, islands and hinterlands.
Figure 2: showing the location of Niger state in Nigeria, Adapted from Macmillan Atlas 2008.

The Nupe ethnic groups are found to be concentrated in 9 local government areas of Niger State and 2 local governments in Kwara State, (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Showing Nupe community Local Governments, in Niger, and Kwara State (source?)

Nupe people have rich cultural and political system which was established before the intervention of Islamic and Christian missionaries,(Nadel, 1942). They
have some rich cultural heritage associated with how they relate with each other and also their landscape. It is therefore imperative that such cultural landscape is studied and documented.

However for an effective cultural landscape to be studied, it will require close observation and interaction with the indigenous people with a view to interpret the cultural landscape through the perspective of the local people; this is buttressed by, Brewer, (2000) Creswell, (2012) and O'Reilly, (2009). Ethnography which is the science of gathering information about people by living with them provides the best avenue for cultural landscape studies,(Blommaert and Jie, 2010). Ethnography however, requires a lot of time to be spent with the people; this is as a result of certain activities that are seasonal, such as the cultivation period and harvest period. It is therefore necessary for a minimum of one year to be spent in the field especially for a rural farming community (O'Reilly, 2009). Close observation and interaction with Nupe community which is made up of over 100 well established settlements is not possible as such a community will need to be selected.

Doko village community which is located 12 km north-east of Bida, the ancient Nupe kingdom capital, is chosen for the study due to its strategic location of not being a transit village and thus will have limited drastic cultural influences from other cultures. All other villages within the immediate reach of the Nupe capital Bida, are either situated on the transit trade routes or have had early cultural influence by other ethnic groups (Nadel, 1942).

Ethnography which is adopted as the main trust of data collection will however be complemented with qualitative data collections of spaces using ArcGIS. The ethnographic data gathered will be explorative and reflexive. This approach of mixed method is to complement the weakness inherent in the use of only one method (Creswell, 2003, 2012; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004).
1.3 Problem Statement

Cultural landscapes are characterised with uniqueness while Globalization and the adaptation of western cultural landscape concepts is becoming a threat to the uniqueness of cultural landscapes. This problem is more in the developing countries such as Nigeria where cultural studies are not carried out especially on the minority ethnic groups, (Nasongkhla, 2010). Furthermore in a general perspective the researches carried out on cultural landscapes are carried out on western landscapes this can be seen in the works of (Antrop, 1997; Bender et al., 2005; Lee, 2007; Meurk and Swaffield, 2000; Palang, et al., 2011; Pouliot and Treue, 2013; Ruiz and Domon, 2012; Sevenant and Antrop, 2007; Toupal et al., 2001; Tuan, 1977; Wu, 2010).

There is the need to conserve culture, nature and natural landscapes (Monica, 2010). Literature documentation is one of the most important means by which cultural history and cultural heritages are preserved. However, the Nupe ethnic group which is made up of over a million people and with also over 100 well established communities has no detailed cultural literature. The only study carried out on the Nupe people is the anthropological works of Nadel 1942 which was purely based on political and religious realms of the community. The spaces and interaction and meaning associated to Nupe community were not studied. It is therefore necessary to build up the dearth of literature on Nupe community cultural landscape.

Nadel’s study on Nupe People is more than 70 years old and it focused mainly on the economic and political aspects of the Nupe society. The Nupes belong to the second tier of the major ethnic group in Nigeria (Adegbija, 2004). Government policies and members of the research academia have also concentrated more on the major ethnic groups of Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo. Thus it can safely be stated that, there is no any study carried out on Nupe people spaces and there interaction with the landscape. Stephenson (2005) in her research of cultural landscape values of Blackburn in Britain used a cross disciplinary approach to study the cultural landscape which is characterised with being broad and also based on western frame work. The study suggested further studies on a non-western cultural landscape. Thus
this research will contribute to cultural landscape which is based on an African landscape perspective. Furthermore most studies are carried out using questionnaires and interview examples of this are the works of (Antrop, 1997; Soini, et al., 2012; Stephenson, 2007a, 2007b). Some other cultural landscape studies like the works of Abbott, (2003), Antrop, (1997). Bender, et al., (2005); Brown and Weber, 2012; Toupal, et al., 2001) were carried out on spatial pattern of the landscape and how it has changed over time. The observations of the actual interaction of the people and their landscape were not studied as well as the meanings, and values associated with such landscapes. This study is tuned towards the use of ethnography as the primary source of data towards the interpretation of the landscape through the people who inhabit the landscape. This will give an additional dimension in the study of cultural landscape.

1.4 Research Aim and Objectives

1.4.1 Research aim

The aim of this research is to determine the cultural landscape interaction and values of Nupe community in Nigeria.

1.4.2 Research Objectives

1. To identify the values, myths and belief associated with the cultural landscape of Nupe community;
2. To determine the basic Nupe community family structure and its relationship with the landscape

3. To determine the spatial pattern, and typology of Nupe community landscape and;

4. To determine the character of the physical built features and its relationship with the landscape

1.5 Research Questions

1. How are the landscape features of Nupe Community constituted along belief and Values?

2. What are the spatial relationship within the family structure and the landscape?

3. What is the typology of Nupe community cultural landscape and how has it been shaped?

4. What are the prospects and refuge symbols of the Nupe community landscape?

1.6 Significance of the research

The faith of each landscape lies in the hands of the people who inhabit them. Studies have not focused much on the perception of the people who use such landscapes,(de la Fuente de Val et al., 2006). It has therefore become necessary to move beyond external description, to how people value, understand, perceive, and
derive meaning from their landscapes (Linehan and Gross, 1998). The landscape of Nupe community is worthy of study due to its unique character of combining heavy forest as well as savannah vegetations. It is also laden with a lot of cultural myths and beliefs (Nadel, 1942). The multi diversity and cultural relationship of local people makes it paramount to have cultural landscape studied in various settings, (Ruiz and Domon, 2012) . The cultural landscape studies of Nupe community will bridge the void created in literature of Nupe ethnic group. Ethnographic approach to the cultural landscape studies will give an additional dimension because most studies carried out on cultural landscape are quantitative in Nature and structured by the researchers, this can be seen in the works of Brown and Raymond, (2007) Calvin, (1972) Houehanou et al., (2011) &Stephenson, (2007b). The ethnographic dimension will allow theory to be based on the data gathered from the field and as such a Grounded Theory will be generated on spatial pattern, values, myths and social interaction within Nupe communities.

The protection of indigenous cultural landscape from alteration and influence from other culture is very difficult Stephenson (2007a), thus it has become necessary especially in Nigeria for the minority ethnic groups like the Nupe, to have their cultural landscape documented. The documentation in the body of literature will also help in the proper integration of Nupe ethnic group cultural values in government policies.

1.7 Scope and limitation of the research

Ethnographic approach to cultural landscape studies requires a lot of time to be spent with the people (Blommaert and Jie, 2010; Brewer, 2000). As such for an effective ethnographic work to be carried out within the span of the time available for this work, only one Nupe community is chosen for the cultural landscape studies. Doko Village is chosen as earlier mentioned due to its remoteness when compared to other rural Nupe communities with significant population of over 30,000. Although
easily accessible, it is not however located on a transit route. As such it is not prone to rapid cultural influences from other ethnic groups. Nupes were known to have practiced a traditional religion called “gunu”, (Nadel, 1942), however the early 19th century Islamic and Christianity missions have caused the conversion of most Nupe to the practice of Islam or Christianity. Thus it will be difficult to clearly distinguish the effect of Islam and Christianity in Nupe community cultural landscape. The use of ethnography in cultural landscape studies will require some time to be spent in order to capture all the activities of the people, as there are activities that are seasonal,(Brewer, 2000). This study therefore requires a minimum of one season to be spent in the field. A farming community such as Doko will require a minimum of one year to be spent as a result of cultural landscape activities that will be associated with pre planting and post-harvest periods.
1.8 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

1.9 Introduction

This chapter explains the meaning of culture in the context of cultural landscape research and the paradigms of cultural landscape studies. It further goes to explain the various scales on which cultural landscape is assessed, and types of values associated with cultural landscape. The conclusion explains the theoretical framework for the study which is the Prospect-Refuge Theory.

1.10 The concept of culture and cultural landscape

Culture is constituted with a system which is made up of inherited symbols and objects used in communication and generation of meaning between people (Linehan and Gross, 1998). Cultural landscape as the interaction of people with their immediate environment over a period of time, shapes the environment (Appleton, 1975). The landscape and culture also determine how the environment is shaped (Rapoport, 1969). Cultural landscape studies have been carried out in various paradigms. These paradigms have been enumerated by Zube, et al. (1982) to be the Expert paradigm, Psychophysical paradigm, Cognitive paradigm and Experiential paradigm as illustrated in Figure 4.

The expert paradigm is based on the evaluation of landscape by professionals such as the landscape economist, the ecologist, the geologist and several other landscape related professionals. However even within the premise of these paradigms, landscapes are valued differently. For example, an ecologist realm of concern in the landscape is the living organisms within the landscape (Naveh, 1995).
The psychologist may look at landscape in the context of sensory stimuli experience of people while the political scientist who looks at landscape value in terms of the geographical territorial boundary control.

In furtherance to the paradigms of study, the archaeologist and historians emphases are on the buried landscape, (Stephenson, 2007a). Here the human interaction is not of much concern. Most landscape architects also could be seen to focus more on the beauty and aesthetic of the surface value. These perceptions are most of the time based on the landscape architect’s view as an outsider and not that of the indigenous people.

The psychophysical paradigm looks at and assesses people’s evaluation of landscape properties and qualities. Here the scale of measurement is through the people’s view and thus may differ from the expert’s assessment.

The cognitive paradigm is concerned with the meaning people associate to their landscape, while the experiential paradigm looks at landscape as the complete relationship between man and the landscape, in which both are shaping each other. Landscape component here is thus simply summed up as the human component and the landscape itself.

It is however important to see and interpret the landscape through the lens of the people who inhabit the landscape. This has been stressed by Claval,
This is because the interaction of people and their landscape has few studies, (Rapoport, 2004). The few studies carried out are however focused on western concepts (Palang, et al., 2011). Such studies could be seen in the works of Brown and Raymond, (2007) De Aranzabal, et al., (2008), Sherren et al.( 2011) and Stephenson, (2007a &b). There is therefore some dearth of studies on cultural landscape which are also dominated by the western culture. The satellite of cultural landscape therefore needs to focus on the non-western culture.

1.11 Cultural landscape scale and interaction

Cultural landscape scale is defined by the inclination of the profession. The geographer looks at landscape as a complete territory that could be made up of several regions (Backhaus, 2011; Claval, 2005; Hills, 1974). The landscape architect defines the scale to be the immediate environment surrounding the liveable space of a given community (Appleton, 1975). The professional paradigm of inclination also affects the interpretation of landscape. The natural scientists scale could vary from a small pond to a large lake but limited to a specific relationship between the biotic and abiotic feature elements within such territory. The ecologist’s scale of study extends to the biodiversity and geo-morphological forms. The social scientist and the political scientist scale of cultural landscape is based on the territorial boundaries under the control, this can vary from a local community to a whole nation. Thus landscape varies in scale and therefore depends on who is involved in the interpretation of such landscape. However for the purpose of this study, the scale of cultural landscape is bounded by the extent to which the natural landscape has been modified by man over a period of time, (Appleton 1975). This extent depends on how the community adapts and reshapes its landscape towards fulfilling the biological needs of man.
1.12 Landscape values

The paradigm of studies reflects the emphasis on the types of values associated with cultural landscape. Most scientific researchers are inclined towards the tangible aspect of the landscape (Backhaus, 2011; Naveh, 1995; Stephenson, 2007a; Wu, 2010). However cultural landscape as earlier defined for this study is associated with both tangible and intangible values. The intangible values of the landscape are associated with attributes of the landscape that cannot be physically seen, such as beliefs, and meaning people give to their landscape. The tangible aspects are related to the landscape features which are physical, such as spaces, farms, vegetation, buildings, roads, streams and mountains.

The perspective of the natural scientist is on the values that can be gotten from the landscape, while the Artist; looks at landscape as an object of beauty (Appleton, 1975). The landscape in the perspective of the psychologist is the immediate environment of an individual and how such environment shapes the individual.

In this study landscape is looked upon as the immediate surroundings of the living space were people interact during the course of their daily activities, their relationship with one another and the meaning they ascribe to their landscape (Linehan and Gross, 1998). Landscape is a recognizable environment which is dynamic and also more than the sum total of the individual entities that makes it (Antrop, 1997). This means that the summation of individual units of interaction with landscape would not give the true reflection of a cultural landscape. What will give the true reflection will be the study of the whole community in its entirety and its relationship with the landscape. This relationship however is associated with tangible and intangible attributes(Stephenson, 2007a). The tangible outcome of such interaction is the physical changes made to the landscape, while the intangible aspects of the interactions are associated with feelings. This suggests that the relationship with landscape goes beyond the physical attributes and thus could have values experienced by individuals within the given community.(Ruiz and Domon, 2012).
Zube, et al. (1982) while citing (Calvin, 1972) stated that the most significant factors of any landscape are scenic natural beauty, human activities and water. (Calvin et al 1972). However, Appleton (1975) posits that, the aesthetics of landscape is more on the experience, behaviours and relationships with the environment; it is therefore not limited to the form, order and pattern of the landscape. Aesthetics in landscape is achieved only when the biological needs of man is attained, with vegetation as the most important element within the landscape (Appleton, 1975). This can be argued since it is not all landscapes that are with vegetation, this is seen in deserts and arctic regions.

Be it as it may, the landscape is shaped towards satisfying the biological needs of man which is only possible when the state of aesthetics is achieved. An aesthetic landscape is a landscape that meets the conditions of prospect-refuge theory which stipulates that a landscape must provide the ability to see without being seen and also a sense of protection (refuge) from animals, humans and the climatic elements. The definition of landscape by Appleton formed the basic foundation for the valuation of landscape and it therefore opened up an avenue on which all cultural landscape can be studied (Caborn, 1975). Each landscape is characterised with prospects, refuge and hazards, thus aesthetics will be determined on the state of balance between these factors as constituted within any given landscape. Thus this provides a premise upon which all landscapes can be evaluated.

The experience people have with their environment is what leads to a sense of place, (Soini et al., 2012). The sense of place of people depends on the cultural values associated with the landscape, while human values and perceptions affect landscape interaction (Rapoport, 1969, 2004). Values associated with the landscape can be spiritual, economic or cultural (Ja’afar et al., 2012). For example the values associated to rural farming community are productivity, sacredness, aesthetics, organic, market, heritage, recreation, and habitat (Brown and Raymond, 2007; Brown and Weber, 2012; Ruiz and Domon, 2012). The strength allotted to each of these values mentioned will also depend on the community and its landscape. A riverine community will thus have a different habitat from a non-riverine community. However the values associated with cultural landscape can be categorised and analysed under form, relationship and practice (Stephenson,
This gives simple categorisations under which cultural landscape relationships can be studied.

“Form” in cultural landscape means the way the environment is shaped, the buildings and also such features as the location of streams, and the formation of the roads. “Relationship” means the feelings and rootedness of people with their landscape, while “Practice” is the actions and interactions of people with their landscape.

The most effective way in which cultural landscape can be understood is through the lens of the indigenous people. Ethnography which is the science of study of people’s culture by living and interacting with the people offers an effective means for the study of cultural landscape, (Blommaert, 2010). The cultural landscape of a given community is derived from the physical environment and the tradition of the people (Appleton, 1975). Traditions of people are engrossed with tangible and intangible variables and also with symbology that cannot be interpreted by observations alone without the risk of misinterpretations.

The framework for the study of symbology of cultural landscape cannot be understood through observations alone. This is because of the gap that exists between what a symbol is and what it represents within the cultural landscape. For example the placement of a leaf on an object in Nigeria signifies different meanings depending on the context and also the cultural landscape. In some Nupe rural communities, when a leaf or grass is placed on an object, it signifies ‘don’t touch’ while the same analogy in some communities signifies that the item is for sale. Thus this suggests that, the mere observation of symbol will not necessarily give the full meaning unless it is interpreted through the perspectives of the people. Rituals and folklore are full of this symbology and thus ethnography provides the strategy for eliciting the meaning of these symbols.

Ethnography which involves the engagement of the researcher in the field and also relating and interacting with the people through a systematic data collection on shared belief, behaviours, language and common social interaction within a given community, provides a good means for the interpretation of the landscape (Brewer, 2000). This involves the actions taken by individuals within a cultural setting, the
individual perceptions and the language within the community, (Blommaert and Jie, 2010; Creswell, 2012)

1.13 Philosophical paradigm

The philosophical paradigm is the theoretical frame work and system employed to view events (Fellows and Liu, 2008). It elaborates and shows view and perspectives that are adopted in the determination of a phenomenon. The two paradigm school of thoughts are the positivism and the interpretivism. The purist of these two paradigms have for a long time been criticising each other on the weakness inherent in each of the philosophical paradigms (Brown and Weber, 2012; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004)

The positivists are inclined to Cartesian duality of the existence of reality; that there are observable facts out there in the field that can be measured by an observer. The paradigm of the positivist is inclined more towards quantitative data and the researcher is completely detached from the investigation. The positivist believes that social observations should be treated like the way physical scientist treat physical phenomena (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The critics of positivist position posit that there is no such thing as an absolute true situation out there in the world and that the claim that the researcher is detached from the experiment is not true, because the personal insight of the positivist researcher and his background knowledge influences the outcome of the research. For example in some experiments margin of errors could occur due to error of parallax, thus suggesting that the persona and the accuracy of measurement can be influenced by the person taking the measurement.

The interpretivism or (constructivism) paradigm asserts that reality is attained through the construct of the researcher and thus reality is seen through the researcher’s perceptions. The constructivist paradigm thus posits that, construct realities are bound and that, time and context are free from generalizations and as
such they are not desirable (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). It also advocates that the truth and reality are attained through the perspectives of the participants. It thus suggests that intensive interview and discussion with the participants will enhance the true reflection of reality. The paradigm advocates for inductive approach which entails study from the specific to the general. However interpretivism is criticised to have the tendency of bias by the individual as a result of the direct involvement of the researcher.

The purists of the two paradigms of positivism and the constructivism have long been at cross road on each other’s research inclination. To bridge this gap, the pragmatists believe that the approach to research can be a mixed method approach (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Research is also becoming more complex and therefore may require all paradigms of thoughts to be applied for effective results to be obtained. In another perspective for example, the study of cultural landscape will require a cross disciplinary input and thus a mix of philosophical ideology or school of thought

Research paradigms are thus not completely devoid of deficiency but this problem can be reduced through triangulation of approaches, modelling and theories (Creswell, 2012; Fellows and Liu, 2008; Kumar, 1999; Yin, 2009). Cultural landscape studies which involves people and environment relationship, requires the pragmatic approach as the means for full understanding of the relationship. Pragmatism as illustrated in Figure 5, is an approach, in which the choice of philosophical framework is based on what will give the most satisfying answer to an objective. This suggests that a research with several objectives may have its objectives answered with the mix of positivism and interpretivism.
Figure 5: Pragmatism as a balance between the positivism and interpretivism

Pragmatism is thus taken to be the framework on which this cultural landscape studies will be based upon.

1.14 Theoretical framework

Cultural landscape has earlier been established to be the interaction of indigenous people and their environment (Section 2.3, page 11 above.). The framework on which the research is established is based on the Habitat theory which also stipulates that a landscape is chosen and arranged for the favourable condition and survival of the community (Appleton, 1975). It further stipulates that inborn instincts and acquired knowledge from the older generation of a given community are the premises upon which the relationships with the environment are established. These relationships with the landscape are geared towards satisfying the biological needs of man and also that the aesthetics of each landscape depends on how effective the prospect-refuge theory is attained. The Prospect-Refuge Theory of Appleton (1975), established that a landscape must fulfil the following conditions:

i. Prospect (To see without being seen).

ii. Refuge (protection)
Appleton (1975) further asserted that, the variables for the measurement of the aesthetic of landscape as follows:

i. Objects provided for prospects and refuge

ii. Manner and intensity within which they are symbolized

iii. Spatial arrangement of the symbols

iv. Equilibrium of refuge and prospects symbols

v. The physical media in which those symbols are communicated to the observer.

In his study of two landscapes in south east Australia and victoria all in Australia, Heyligers (1981), tried to put to test the prospect refuge theory. The study explored the landscape of bare sand dunes and vegetated dunes carried out in three different types of landscapes of complete desert, that with vegetation show that the prospect refuge theory is applicable in assessing the landscape. although the balance in the symbolism of prospects and refuge varied. The landscape itself could be seen as posing risk due to its sharp boulders even though they provided the vantage point of prospects, the danger it poses and the steepness form an obstacle for freedom of movement. A later review of the prospect refuge theory by Hudson (1992) portrayed the effectiveness of prospect refuge as a basis for the evaluation of landscape.

The variables outlined above will require a pragmatic approach for the collection of information, which is qualitative and quantitative. However in the use of mix method, qualitative data through ethnography will be collected and the data collected will then be enhanced through triangulation with quantitative data. Cultural landscape study which is based on the premise of exploration will result into the generation of Grounded Theory from the data gathered from the field. The use of Grounded Theory as an approach to the interpretation of data gathered from the field. The various concepts of Grounded Theory research and the choice of a concept are explained in research Methodology (chapter 3).
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research methodology

2.2 Introduction

This chapter discusses research methodology that will be employed for this research. The choice of Grounded Theory approach to the research is explained and its amiability for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. Cultural landscape variables are enumerated and the choice and the concept of ethnography as the main source of data are explained. The chapter concludes with the approach for the analysis of the data which will involve the use of ArcGIS and Nvivo for spatial and content analysis respectively.

2.3 Research approach

Zube (1987) while building on the works of (Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Seamon, 1979) and also on the reviews of the literature (Lowenthal, 1979; Sopher, 1979) stressed that for a landscape research that is centred on the total experience and perception of interaction of people with landscape, it is not possible to study such relationship through quantitative technique alone, rather the approach should be through unstructured exploration.
The effective cultural landscape studies requires to put into consideration Social family structure, Activity system, Life style, Values, Ideals and beliefs (Rapoport, 2004). Cultural landscapes are associated with dialectic and deep meaning of those who occupy the landscape, (Naveh, 1995). The landscape is thus best studied through the people who occupy the landscape (Toupal et al., 2001). Cultural Landscape studies require the use of both quantitative and qualitative approach, (Marcucci, 2000; Moore, 2005). The reliance on one method of either qualitative or quantitative will not give a true and complete picture of cultural landscape, (Abbott, 2003). The study of cultural landscape of any community is made up of “form”, “practice” and “relationship”, (Appleton, 1975; Nassauer, 1995; Stephenson, 2007a). It therefore requires measurements that will answer all the three categories of variables.
Qualitative and quantitative data is therefore required in the study of cultural landscape and as such a mix method approach will be an effective means to the study of cultural landscape. The mix method approach will also allow for the compliment of the weakness in each of the methods. Creswell (2012), classified mixed method research design into six different categories which are, the Parallel, the Explanatory, the Explorative, the Embedded, the Transformative and the Multi-phased designs.

The convergent parallel mix method design allows for the simultaneous collection of both quantitative and qualitative data from the field. The data collected are given equal strength but they are however analysed separately. The results are interpreted to see if they both support or contradict each other. The weakness with the convergent parallel design is on how to merge the two separate results analysed from the qualitative and quantitative data, (Creswell, 2012).

The Explanatory sequential mixed method approach allows for the collection of quantitative data first, this highlights the research problems which are then followed by qualitative data to give explanations or solutions to the problems raised by the quantitative data. Here emphasis is placed more on the qualitative data. The presentations of the data and analysis are clearly presented in the headings of the report. The qualitative data is used to explain the results from the quantitative data. The advantage of this method is that the quantitative and qualitative data are clearly identifiable. The weakness of this approach is the time consumed in sieving out information from the quantitative data.

In the Embedded design mixed method, the researcher collects both the qualitative and quantitative data during the study. The sequence for the collection of data type can vary. However the data sets are collected and analysed separately to answer different research questions within the study. The framework of embedded mixed method is for addressing social issues such as feminist agenda, racial, ethnic and disability rights. The Multi-phase design method is a complex mixed method research design which builds on the basic components of explorative, explanatory, and embedded design. It is most useful for researches that require multi-disciplinary approach.
The exploratory sequential design allows for the collection of the qualitative data first, before the quantitative data. The emphasis is more on the qualitative data, while the quantitative data is thereafter used to explain the relationship found in the qualitative data. It is a useful methodology for the exploration of a phenomenon. The approach allows for measures to be grounded in the data gotten from the field rather than going to the field with predetermined variables (Creswell, 2012). This is more amenable to the cultural landscape data collection through ethnography and thus it will be used for the collection of data for this research see Figure 7

Figure 7: showing the explorative research method sequence: (source Creswell 2012 page no?).

Ethnography approach will serve as the main trust on which qualitative data will be generated. This is because, it will allow for the capturing of how people interact, perceive and give meaning to their landscape, (Blommaert and Jie, 2010; Brewer, 2000; O'Reilly, 2009; Risjord, 2007). This will then build into the collection of spatial and morphology of the landscape, this morphological study of cultural landscape can be seen in the studies carried out by (Abbott, 2003; Bender et al., 2005; Brown and Raymond, 2007; Brown and Weber, 2012; Gunner, 2005; Sevenant and Antrop, 2007; Wästfelt et al., 2012)

2.4 Grounded Theory Design concepts

Grounded Theory has two sets of meaning; first it involves a systematic procedure of research for the collection and analysis of data and the second meaning is the product of the complete analysis of the output. (Charmaz and Bryant, 2010).
Grounded Theory is the generation of theory based on qualitative data. It is a systematic qualitative theory that explains a process, an action or an interaction about a substantive topic. The theory so generated is to be grounded based on the data from the field. It allows for the close link on the data collected from the field, this makes it amiable with ethnographic data collection. Creswell (2012) classified the approach to grounded theory into three; these are the systematic, the emerging and the constructivist design.

The systematic design of Grounded Theory emphasises the use of open coding and the development of a visual picture of the theory generated. It involves the systematic step by step rigorous procedure of open, axial and selective coding and the development of the logic or pictorial analysis of the theory generated. It shows the categorization of all data into main categories and sub-categories with details on how the data were collected.

The emerging design concept of Ground Theory believes in the importance of letting the theory emerge from the data rather than using specific pre-set categories. Here pictorial or diagrammatical explanations are not required rather it comparers incidents to incidents, incidents to categories and categories to categories. In emerging design the data collected are analysed immediately before the next step is taken. The data is sieved continuously until the saturation point is reached. The disadvantage of this method is that it does not agree with the utilisation of diagrams

The constructivist design emphasises more on the meaning ascribed by the participants in the study. Here the focus is on the values, beliefs, feelings, assumptions and ideologies of the individuals rather than the gathering of facts and describing them. It also focuses on narrations from individuals’ feelings and values which may end without conclusion. However the two paradigms converge on five main points, (Charmaz, 2003):

i. Emphasize constructing emergent theories with new ideas;

ii. Contend that qualitative research could generate theory;

iii. View Grounded Theory as a method for conducting rigorous, procedural analyses;
iv. Advocate using comparative methods throughout the analytic process; and

v. Intend to provide specific tools for theory construction

The gathering of information on cultural landscape is made up of form, relationship and interaction (Stephenson, 2007a). The establishment of absolute categories for an ethnographic approach to data collection is not possible, because some categories of variable may arise from the field. However it is possible to go to the field with some categories established on the premise of being modifiable in the field. This will allow for a more focused information gathering. The main criteria according to Creswell (2012) is for a grounded theory to fulfil four criteria which are fit, work, relevance and modifiability. Fit here refers to the non-contradiction to the realities on ground, while work is for the theory to be able to explain the variations. The theory should also be relevant to the phenomena being studied and should be modifiable when new sets of data become available. In summary the key characteristics of Grounded Theory research is guided by

i. Process approach

ii. Theoretical sampling

iii. Constant comparative data analysis

iv. A core category

v. Theory generation and

vi. Memos.

2.5 Data collection

Cultural landscape is associated with a historical data which is gotten principally from documentary evidence of books, journals, notebooks, periodicals,
anthropological data especially oral history, ecological data, and archaeological data (Marcucci, 2000). Environmental history and the representations of landscape history are embedded within the frame of oral histories, gender and property rights, dimensions of institutional arrangement, resource usage, economics and environmental knowledge of the people (Nash, 2000).

These are all sources of information for which landscape could be studied. The approach to this research has earlier been established to be pragmatic. Pragmatic approach to research requires multiple data collection strategies, approach and methods, (Creswell, 2012; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). This allows for the strengthening of the data which will help the validity of the research outcome. It thus means that for a pragmatic stance both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected. The pragmatic stance is chosen because effective cultural landscape studies will require information that is quantitative and qualitative. The need for such mixed information can be also be seen in the works of (Altman and Zube, 1989; Antrop, 1997; Backhaus, 2011; Bender, et al., 2005; Brown and Raymond, 2007; Brown and Weber, 2012; Calvin, 1972; Claval, 2005; Ina Gavra, 2012; Lin, 2012).

Prospect-refuge theory gives a universal medium upon which all landscape can be measured. It stipulates that the aesthetic of any given landscape is based on the prospect (ability to see without being seen) and refuge (that is protection against both animate and inanimate features of the landscape (Appleton, 1975). The variables for the measurement of the prospect and refuge are:

i. Objects provided for prospects and refuge

ii. Manner and intensity within which they are symbolized

iii. Spatial arrangement of the symbols

iv. Equilibrium of refuge and prospects symbols and

v. The physical media in which those symbols are communicated to the observer

A recent study by Toupal, et al. (2001), outlined cultural landscape variables to be, resources, places and landscape. While Terkenli (2001) opined that the
framework on which cultural landscape can be studied and interpreted to be visual aspects (forms), cognitive aspects (meanings) and the experiential aspects (function). This goes in line with a more recent framing of cultural landscape studies on form, practice and relationship,(Stephenson, 2007a, 2007b). Thus the collection of data will be done and categorised under “Form”, “Practice” and “Relationship” as illustrated in figure 10.

Form as a variable refers to the physical tangible features such as landforms, water body and vegetation while Practice is the actions and interactions with the landscape. Relationship is the meaning generated by people such as stories, aesthetics, belief naming and myths(Stephenson, 2007b).

![Figure 10: The cultural landscape variable categorization. Modeled on Stephenson 2007](image)

2.6 Variables of cultural landscape

Cultural landscape attributes and variables depend on who is describing it. The attributes as illustrated in Figure 8, by different persons attest to this fact.
The prospect refuge theory of Appleton (1975) looks at cultural landscape to be constituents of variables that provide, prospect and refuge, spatial arrangement of symbols and the relationship and communication of people with themselves and the environment. Terkenli’s (2001) assessment of cultural landscape is on the visuals, experiential, and the cognitive experience of the people. However Rapoport (2004) suggested that for an effective cultural landscape to be studied, the social family structure, the activity system, the values and ideals people associate to their landscape will need to be studied. A more recent cultural study by Stephenson (2007b), surmised cultural landscape variables to be made up of Form, Relationship and Interaction. These therefore constitute the main latent variables as illustrated in Figure 9 for the study.
2.7 Sources of data collection

The sources of gathering data for cultural landscape will be multiple as illustrated in Figure 11. This is to allow for data triangulation towards the attainment of construct validity, (Charmaz, 2003; Creswell, 2003, 2012; Yin, 2009).

Figure 9: Summary of cultural landscape attributes (Appleton, 1975; Rapoport, 2004; Stephenson, 2007; Terkenli, 2001)

Figure 11: sources of evidence for case study research, (adapted from, Yin 2009)

Table 1: showing the summary of questions and methods of assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN VARIABLES</th>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>METHODS OF ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Census Data Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>Geographic boundaries</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community natural resources</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community demographic makeup</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical, Administrative, social and economic boundaries</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prospects and refuge within the landscape</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure and public services</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community Layout</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compound layout</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landscape features (Man made and Natural)</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICE</td>
<td>Community interaction and information flow</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Family use of spaces (daily living)</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community use of space</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sources of water and Energy</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>source of building material</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic value from landscape (occupation and sources of income)</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property/ land ownership structure</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>How people in the community define their landscape (topography, buildings, streets boundaries etc)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the community’s values and priorities</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What motivates the community and why</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community's understand and perception relating to quality of life</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the meanings associated to various elements within the community</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spiritual values of landscape</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myths associated with the landscape</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The multiple sources of data for the study are, ethnography, (participant observation) documents, archival records, open-ended interviews, focused interviews, maps and shape files of the study area. The approach to the use of these sources is explained in the next section.

2.7.1 Ethnographic data collection

Ethnography is concerned with the collection of data for anthropological theorization (Risjord, 2007). Ethnographic approach to data collection is also categorised into three distinctive methods, (Creswell, 2012) The realist, the case study and the critical theory approach. The realist ethnography approach to research is based on a third person report and it does not offer personal reflection of the researcher. The report is left raw and unbiased, it is characterised with careful presentation of quotations the way they are collected from the field. The problem with this is that, it may offer no meaning to the reader or the audience. The critical approach to ethnography is focused on advocating for a course; it is the type of ethnography that puts emphasis on the emancipation of a marginalized group and is laden with value orientation and empowerment of people. It seeks to fight for the course of those who have been dominated, oppressed or victimized. This, thus will not serve academic research because the report is prone to bias and also contradictions.

The case study approach focuses on an in-depth approach to the collection of data from the field through various means such as video recordings, audio recordings, interviews and questionnaires. Its approach to analysis is reflexive and the final report can be objective or subjective. The bias of the researcher can clearly be stated and the report can be generalized within the context of the study. The
reflexivity in report writing allows for an open minded interpretation of observations based on the understanding of the researcher. It also allows for the multiple perspectives of what is observed to be presented in the report, while the audience is allowed to make the final judgments, (Creswell, 2012). This approach will thus be used for the study.

The data collected in ethnography are either emic, etic or negotiated data. Emic data are those collected and supplied in the participants own language. These forms of data are critical as some meaning and values associated with the name given to the action or item. These form of information will require to be presented in the respondents own language with explanation to such words. The etic data are those collected from the field based on the researcher’s representations of the observations from the field. This form of data will therefore be presented as the researcher’s analogy.

The field work in ethnography may touch some sensitive issues in the field that may be unethical to be published without the consent of the participants. Here the researcher and the participants will agree on what to be included in the report.

In ethnography, language provides an avenue for discovering the way people understand and perceive their environment, (Fantini, 1995). Thus where questions will be asked and interviews conducted, it will be in the native language of the people.

2.7.2 Documents

The type of information that can be gathered from this category of data will be from similar studies that have been carried out. However for this particular case study, it has been established that no cultural landscape study has been carried out on the Nupes, but similar studies carried out elsewhere will be sources of additional information for the research.
2.7.3 Archival records

Archival records are the repository for historic information; the type of information that can be gathered here are old census data and old maps. This can give details on how the community has evolved over a period of time. Archival records also compliment the data collected from the field (Philips and Johns, 2012). The archives that hold the cultural artefacts of Nupe Ethnic group in Nigeria will be consulted in the course of building up data on Nupe people of Nigeria.

2.7.4 Open-ended interviews

One of the important sources of information in case studies is the interview, (Yin, 2009). For an explorative study, the interview will be structured open-ended. This is to allow the participants to discuss extensively and also allow the data to be gathered without forcing the respondents to specific question. This will also allow for the monitoring and generation of information that would probably will have been skipped if the interview has been structured.

2.7.5 Focused interviews

Each community is structured with different hierarchy of people and professions within the community. It is also possible to find that within a Nupe community a particular house hold may be found to be engaged in a particular profession for example fishing or blacksmithing. Focused interview will also allow for a deep understanding of a case where general observations will not capture the
required information from the group. It also allows for a social construct understanding of a phenomenon within the group, (Philips and Johns, 2012). This is because information is more likely to prompt up in a social gathering than can be found from an individual from the group.

2.7.6 Maps and Geographic Information System (GIS)

Cultural landscape is guided by geographic boundaries and the understanding of such boundaries is better expressed through the use of cadastral maps. These maps are now in digital forms and they are called the geographic information system. They are sometimes available free on the web while in some cases they are gotten from government agencies. The geographic information of the study area in Nigeria will be acquired from National Space Research and Development Agency of Nigeria (NSRDA). The level of information on such maps depends on what is to be studied. More information can however be added from field work to suit the type of information and analysis that is going to be carried out. However, recent study carried out in China by Yang, et al. (2012) shows that it is possible to use High resolution images from Google Earth© for the study of rural population distribution and also the extraction of landscape features. The readily available Google Earth© images will therefore be used when the GIS files becomes difficult to acquire. ArcGIS will speed up the work of spatial analysis and representation (Abbott, 2003), and it will aid in data Compilations, Information Queries, spatial Analysis Cartographic Production, image visualisation and data management.
2.8 Data Analysis

Data analysis from multiple sources requires to be narrowed down towards answering the research objectives. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) suggested the process for data analysis as illustrated in table 2 as a means to which so process can be attained.

Table 2 Data analysis process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data reduction</td>
<td>Reduction of the dimensionality for qualitative data, and for quantitative data (eg factor Analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data display</td>
<td>E.g. The use of tables, charts and graphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data transformation</td>
<td>Qualitative data transformed to numeric data for analysis while quantitative data converted to descriptive narrative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data correlation</td>
<td>The correlation of qualitative and quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative data combined to form either a new consolidated data set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing of data</td>
<td>Comparing qualitative and quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Integration</td>
<td>Here the data are integrated to form a coherent whole or separated into qualitative and quantitative data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Johnson, 2004)

Ethnographic research entails a lot of field notes and the creation of categories which will require to be narrowed down into key categories. From the key categories the main category so chosen will thus be subjected to triangulation from other data gathered from quantitative method. Thus the outline of data analysis outlined in table 2 will be utilised in the data analysis process.

2.8.1 Use of ArcGIS©

Geographic information system is one of the most effective means of assessing long term cultural landscape, (Bender, et al., 2005). The communication
and interpretation of landscape is enhanced, because it facilitates understanding between the researcher and the local people who are not experts. The increase in the use of GIS is as a result of improvement in the capabilities and also the reduction in the cost of software (Appleton and Lovett, 2003). The development of GIS and its software however may not completely give the true picture of the reality on ground. This implies that a field survey or inventory will be required for the collection of detail information before an analysis can be made. This procedure is illustrated in Figure 10.

Fig 10: The flow diagram for GIS Data processing, source modified; (Abbott, 2001, 2003)

Network analysis will be used to analyse the landscape interaction of people and their landscapes. This will be carried out using the best route algorithm, closest facility algorithm and spatial statistics in ArcGIS. The output of this analysis will be the spatial patterns, spatial relationships, distances and spaces.
2.8.2 Nvivo

The three main strategies for grounded theory as a method are memo writing, coding and theoretical sampling (Charmaz and Bryant, 2010). Ethnography is associated with the collection of voluminous data which needs to be reduced as illustrated in Table 2. Nvivo 10© is a computer software developed by QSR international capable of organizing and sharing of qualitative data (QSR, 2013). It also allows for the comparison between qualitative and quantitative data. The capabilities of Nvivo depends on the creativity of the user, however some of its capabilities are organisation of documents, PDFs, datasets, audio, video, pictures, memos and framework matrices. Coding which is the process of gathering material by topic, theme or case is made easier and faster, this is illustrated in Figures 12 and 13. Nodes which are the repository for codes are also recorded for the generation of emerging patterns and ideas.

Figure 12: Node creation based on theme (category) adapted from QSR, (2013)

Figure 13: Node creation based on case or a respondent, source adapted from QSR, (2013)
Nvivo10© software also allows for references to be recorded and also exchanged between compatible reference managers such as Endnote© and Zotero©. Nvivo© will thus form the primary platform on which Data from the field will be coded, processed for content analysis.

2.9 Anticipated Results

There are many benefits derivable from the study of Nupe cultural landscape studies. For the first time the social spatial interaction and relationship of Nupe ethnic group with their environment will be captured. The anticipated findings will give a detail understanding of how the Nupe people define their landscape and the reasons behind such definitions. A better understanding of the myths and belief associated with the landscape and also how this shapes the day to day living within the community. Furthermore it is expected that the meaning and interpretation of landscape by the Nupe ethnic group will help in the policy formulations on cultural landscape associated with Nupe people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMESTER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTHS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH PROPOSAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Research Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Aim and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation of proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of cultural landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study on ethnography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study on grounded theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools and software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination of study area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 conference papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data Collection (Geospatial data) site 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Data collection (spatial data) site 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Pilot study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Data collection (site 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection on site 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection on site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Scopus paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Content Analysis (using Nvivo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Analysis (using ArcGIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Grounded theory on Nupe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 journal paper for journal of Human Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 journal paper for journal of Space and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION AND REPORT WRITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and writing of Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafts submission to supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction and preparation of final draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report writing submission to SPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIVA AND CORRECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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