Full Length Research Paper

Perceptions on cultural significance and heritage conservation: A case study of Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria

Adedeji Joseph Adeniran[1]* and Fadamiro Joseph Akinlabi[2]

[1]Department of Architecture, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, P.M.B. 4000
Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Architecture, Federal University of Technology, P.M.B. 704, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria.

The built environment is the history of man. The undying stones of monuments are the tables from which this history can be read. Thus, the life of man in the past, its values in the present and directions for the future are embellished on these stones. Historic cultural heritages cannot be expressed in any other better form than in buildings. Sussan Wenger's building located in Osogbo, Nigeria is one of such buildings. The fabric of the building is synonymous to the history of this Austrian woman who indigenized and became a priestess of the Osun goddess in the course of which she was named "Adunni Olorisa". The study was carried out to determine people's perceptions on the cultural significance and heritage conservation of the building because of the present non-identification of the building with Osun Grove World Heritage Site despite their obvious relationships. The building has history, features and associations with the Osun Sacred Grove which has earned recognition as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO. 203 respondents who are residents of Osogbo were randomly sampled to determine their perceptions on this historic building. The data obtained were subjected to multivariate statistical analysis of means (x) and chi squares (χ^2) based on three hypotheses to find a correlation between respondents and sex, place of origin and rate of observation of the building. Result shows that attitudes towards the building favour the option of conversion of the building to a Museum of Art and Culture. Recommendations were made for the heritage promotions of the building through UNESCO.

Key words: Conservation, Osun Grove, Sussan Wenger, cultural heritage, Osogbo, building, history.

INTRODUCTION

The cultural significance of heritage items qualifies them for conservation. Such conservation or preservation should serve multi-purpose goals embodied in tourism. According to Lynch (1972b) the purpose of preservation can include association of the object, in this case building, with important persons or events. He gave other reasons to include importance as a group symbol, intrinsic qualities in the present, special usefulness as sources of intellectual information about the past and typicality of objects to their time. Tiesdell et al. (1996) justify value for continuity of cultural memory and

heritage, economic and commercial value among important reasons for conservation. They explained that "visible evidence of the past can contribute educationally to the cultural identity and memory of a particular people or place, giving meaning to the present by interpreting the past." Carmona et al. (2003) reiterated the historic significance of cultural urban places that they provide a tangible record of the passage of time and are embodiments of social memory. Therefore the conservation of historic monuments in the environment is the documentary of human existence.

Rapoport (1977) argued that environment functions as an expression of culture, values, activities and relative status. He opined that "social aspects of the city are often judged through the measuring of physical elements,

*Corresponding author. E-mail: niranadedeji@yahoo.com.

which are associational and symbolic." In "continuity and sense of place: the importance of the symbolic image", edited by Freeman (1984) it was argued that "buildings gain meaning through their association with history." He based his argument on the fact that "the perception of a place beyond the everyday reality to this more abstract connection with human history and life is how a conscious sense of place is created and reinforced in a community." Furthermore, Rossi (1982) asserts that urban form is a repository of culture from the past and for the future. The long time span of culture qualifies it as a heritage. Culture spans from the past through the present into the uncertain future. Cultural heritage is thus the history of a society and deserves to be conserved, not just as a monument but to serve tourism purpose. Works that satisfy the tripartite concepts of heritage management, conservation, and tourism are monuments. This description matches Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria. However, lack of its appreciation as a cultural heritage has led to its neglect and dissociation from the already enlisted Osun Grove World Heritage Site. There is a strong socio-cultural and historic relationship between the grove and the building, Sussan Wenger being the life cord that binds the two cultural symbols together. This study focuses on the perception of Osogbo residents on the cultural significance and conservation prospects of this historic building based on three research hypothesis to discover the best practice. These are:

Hypothesis 1: The acceptance of Sussan Wenger's building by Osogbo residents as an historic cultural heritage to be conserved does not depend on gender.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between Osogbo residents perception on the cultural significance and conservation of Sussan Wenger's building and their town of origin.

Hypothesis 3: The rate of observation of Sussan Wenger's building by Osogbo residents has no influence on their perception of the cultural significance and conservation of the building.

The study concludes with herald call to UNESCO not to isolate the building from Osun Grove World Heritage Site and give it equal attention.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Okpoko and Okonkwo (2005) argued in "Heritage Management and Tourism in the Obudu Cattle Ranch and Sukur Kingdom, Nigeria" that there is a tripartite relationship among heritage management, conservation, and tourism. According to Productivity Commission (2005), heritage is of a community, local, state and national interest. It was also argued that community

attitudes to heritage are generally supportive. In a 2005 survey of perceptions of heritage related benefit in Australia, Productivity Commission (2005) discovered that 80% of the respondents regarded historic houses in their area as an important part of the area's character and identity, 92% thought that heritage was part of Australia's identity, 79% thought their life was richer for having opportunity to visit or see heritage, and 93% thought that it is important to protect heritage places even though they never visit them. This result shows that cultural sites, places and artifacts are physical representations of the community.

In Social and Contemporary Significance (RPDC, 2003) of cultural heritage of Tasmanian, it was discovered that the way in which cultural heritage is perceived in contemporary times contributes added meaning and value to that heritage. It was argued that "expressing and recognizing social value in heritage assessments and conservation practice is an important issue to professional people and agencies. The report noted that "conservation decisions should seek to measure the range and strength of stakeholder feeling with respect to the social and contemporary significance of a heritage item. Using the Assessment of the Macquarie Harbour Penal Station's Social and Contemporary Significance (RPDC, 2003) as a case study, the report employed a rating to indicate whether there is significance and the level of the starting is scored out of 10. It was discovered that the Tasmanian wilderness is alien; the site plays a part in the tourism industry and economic well being of the area; many visitors to the site are fascinated by it; the insights into historical theory gained from the studies of the site can be applied elsewhere. The study ultimately led to the establishment of baseline options for management of the site.

Mason and Cheyne (2000) noted that there are few studies on the perceived impacts of tourism either prior to any development or when it is not yet seen to be a significant economic area of activity for a region. Another difficulty is that there are often substantial differences between the values held by the heritage professionals and those held by the community. This has been an outcome of series of studies carried out by Spennemann (1992), Spennemann and Harris (1996) and Spennemann et al. (2001).

Spennemann (2003) argued that the two main pillars on which historic preservation rests are:

(i) The enforcement of compliance with legislatively prescribed processes of protection, evaluation, and on occasion, controlled destruction of heritage properties.

(ii) The education of the public about the need of historic preservation activities.

In his study of "teacher and student perceptions of the cultural heritage of the commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands" Spennemann (2003) discovered that

age, notion of what constitutes "heritage", and place of descent had statistical significant influence on the responses. The result was similar to that of a study of "cultural perceptions of wetlands by primary school teachers in Kenya" by Ndaruga and Irwin (2004). They noted from the data analysis that male and female teachers perceive the value of wetlands differently, there is some relationship between perceptions of wetlands as being of value and the personal benefits which teachers derive from them, and there is a relationship between the age of teachers and the values they hold for wetland.

Stephenson et al. (2004) in Bannockburn Heritage Landscape Study noted that key heritage significance also consists of cultural perceptions and traditions, historic importance and value for providing information about the past and shared significance to community members. From the study, it was discovered that people are unlikely to protect or care for places unless they understand why they are important. Also Bannockburn heritage landscape has excellent potential for education and interpretation and significant heritage value. In a study of Heritage Significance and Vulnerability Assessment of Tokai and Cecilia (SANParks, 2006) the cultural significance of the Heritage Asset Sensitivity Gauge used include: aesthetic significance of the asset; historical significance; educational value and potential; social significance; scientific research value; uniqueness of the asset; indigenous spiritual significance; significance for its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization; importance in the history of South Africa and representativeness of the resource in terms of feature, style, structure, type etc. These parameters were rated between 0 and 3, where 0 implies no value, 1 implies low value, 2 implies moderate value and 3 implies high value. It was discovered that Tokai Manor House Precinct has the highest percentage value of 73% while the Tokai State Forest Roads have the lowest percentage value of 30% along with others.

The examination of the perception of Vietnamese Australians towards national parks also gives an insight into the attitude of people towards heritages. The finding of the study was that many Vietnamese people see national park as peaceful contrasts to the stresses of working lives and cities, a place for recreation that provide leisure and serves as an important venue for religious and scouting activities (Thomas, 2002: 126).

DEFINITION OF KEY WORDS

Conservation: Action taken to prevent decay which embraces all acts that prolong the life of our cultural and national heritage (Fielden, 1994).

Action to secure the survival or preservation of buildings, cultural artifacts, natural resources, energy or any other thing of acknowledged value for the future (British Standards Institution, 1998). Work of those concerned with maintaining the fabric of a city in its original form (Welbank, 1983).

Preservation: The method involving the retention of the building or monument in a sound static condition, without any material addition thereto or subtraction there from, so that it can be handed down to futurity with all the evidences of its character and age unimpaired (Braines, 1923).

Monuments: Architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science (UNESCO,1972).

Culture: The whole complex of distinct spiritual, intellectual, emotional and material features that characterize a particular society or social group and its way of life (Ahmad, 2006).

Heritage: An inheritance or a legacy; things of value which have been passed from one generation to the next (Prentice, 1993).

Traditional notions of cultures, places and buildings (Ahmad, 2006).

Preservation: Maintenance of artifact in its current physical condition.

Restoration: Returning an artifact to the physical condition it had at some previous stage of its life.

Conversion: Adaption of a building to accommodate a new use, also called adaptive reuse.

Reconstruction: Recreation of vanished building on its original site.

Replication: Construction of an exact copy of an existing building.

Facadism: Preservation of the façade of an historic building with a new building behind it.

Demolition and redevelopment: Demolition and clearance with new development on site (Tiesdell et al., 1996).

OSOGBO AND ITS CULTURAL HERITAGE

Osogbo is a cultural Yoruba ethnic city in Nigeria and is currently the capital of Osun State, located in the

Figure 1. The urban core location of Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

Southwestern zone of the country. Geographically, Osogbo is situated on Latitude 7°46' 0" North and Longitude 4° 34' 0" East. By road, Osogbo is 88 km South of Ilorin and 511 km Northwest of Akure.

Osogbo is situated over 500 m above sea-level with and annual rainfall of about 0.6 m lying mainly in the deciduous forest. The town's climate is less humid with strong effect of harmattan winds during the dry season.

According to Falade (2000), Osogbo was historically founded by Olutimehin and Oba Larooye in the 18th century. Since then, the population of Osogbo has been growing steadily. According the National Population Commission, Osogbo has a population of 288,455 (2006 census).

The Cultural Heritage of Osogbo is awesome. The city parades many places of cultural interests because of the abundance of natural artistic talents and natural landscape like River Osun and its grove. These includes the Osun Grove World Heritage Site, Obafemi Awolowo University Museum at Mission Road, Nike Art Gallery, Jimoh Buraimoh's Heritage Foundation, "Twins 77's Keke Elemu's" Gallery, Sussan Wenger's Studio in Sussan Wenger's building under study, the Ataoja's old and new palaces, Idi Baba. Mosaic art, beads, painting, carving, Batik and Tie-dyeing traditional cloth making and other artworks are abundant in Osogbo. The annual Osun Osogbo festival which has attained international prominence, recognition and standard for tourism attracts crowds of tourists from across the globe (Falade, 2000).

SUSSAN WENGER'S BUILDING: A BRIEF DESCRIPTION

Sussan Wenger, Yoruba culturally named "Adunni Olorisa" is the talent behind the misery of this building. She was an Austrian born on 4th July, 1915 and died on 12th January, 2009. She started living in the building in 1958 when she got interested in the worship of Osun goddess. Osun goddess is being worshipped in Osun Grove which is a thick forest of about 89 acres surveyed in 1964. Since Sussan Wenger arrived in Osogbo in 1958 she engaged in art work for the shrines and renovations of the shrines at Idi-Baba, Oja-Oba and later Osun shrine (Falade, 2000). There is similarity in the ingenuity of her works on the shrines and on the building. Between 1968 and 1969 she wrote to UNESCO on the need for the forest preservation of Osun Grove.

Sussan Wenger's building is a stone structure built by one of the Osogbo chiefs in 1929. The building is located in the urban core of Osogbo along Ibokun road (Figure 1) and has a front access by a stair of seven risers with artistic moulded concrete balustrade on either side (Figure 2).

Figure 2. The approach entrance stair to Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

Figure 3. The approach façade three (3) segments of Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

The form of the building is symmetrical with three segments. In the front facade, the left and right identical segments are concrete roofed geometric towers of four floors while the corrugated zinc-roofed middle segment has three floors. The second and third floors are made of timber (Figures 3 and 4). The walls are made of stone

Figure 4. The timber second floor of segments of Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

Figure 5. The stone rubble walls of Sussan Wenger's Building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

rubbles with high relief murals. The two towers have glazed circular vent lights. Majority of the building elements are exhibition of art works. The windows and doors are timber carved and covered with artist fabricated metal burglar proofs (Figures 5 and 6).The window hoods have flowing form while the door and window openings

Figure 6. Carved windows and entrance door of Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

Figure 7. The artwork of the frontage fence of Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

have cornices. The second floor in particular has timber jealousy louver windows with vent light.

The frontage fence of the building and all balcony railings are made of precast balustrades. The building Landscape is amazing. For instance the frontage is almost completely covered by pergola from the ground floor to the third floor. This pergola is made of a large rain forest tree and a climbing plant (Figures 7 and 8).

Figure 8. The pergola in front of fence of Sussan Wenger's building, Osogbo, Nigeria.

Rapoport (1977) submits that "the presence of large trees has positive effects on temperature, sounds, dust and other environmental characteristics." There is also a cactus plant in front of the building. On the whole the building exhibits characteristics and qualities of Brazilian architecture and highly embellished with artwork of human and animal figures including building elements.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted using structured questionnaire, physical observation, and interview. The questionnaire was randomly administered on the residents of Osogbo. The design of the questionnaire was based on the aim of the study to determine Osogbo residents' perceptions on the cultural significance and heritage conservation of Sussane Wenger's building. Carmona et al. (2003) argued that people's awareness, experience, appreciation and perception of their urban environment is an essential dimension of urban design.

The content of the questionnaire are perception factors patterned after Tiesdell et al. (1996) synthesized common justification for building conservation and conservation interventions to historic buildings set out by Fitch (1990) which include: "preservation, restoration, conversion, reconstruction, replication, facadism, demolition and redevelopment". These key issues were synthesized into ten parameters consisting of three appreciation factors and seven possible conservation interventions as follow:

1. The building is a cultural symbol and historic heritage (CSHH).
2. The building has aesthetic value (BHAV).
3. The building has prospect for economic development and tourism (EDAT).
4. Preservation of the building (POTB).
5. Restoration of the artifact (ROTA).
6. Demolition and reconstruction of the building (DROB).

7. Conversion (of the building) to public use (CTPU)
8. Replication of the building (ROTB).
9. Facadism of the building (FOTB).
10. Conversion (of the building) to a museum (CTAM)

Perceptions were rated on ordinal scale devised into an interval scale of strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2), strongly disagree (1) as a continuum.

The sampling frame for the questionnaire administration consisted mainly of people with one level of formal education or the other who had daily, weekly, monthly or yearly observation of the building. Welbank (1983) argued that "the conservation movement starts among an educated elite" in any particular country while Punter (1996) advocates the need to concentrate on "elite business and professional interests in order to capture key decision makers."

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The response rate varies between 77% (157) and 100% (203) because some respondents did not answer some assertions.

Respondents' gender

Table 1 show the perceptions based on gender. The appreciation factors of cultural symbol and historic heritage (CSHH), economic development and tourism (EDAT) and building has aesthetic value (BHAV) have means (X) of 4.37, 4.06, 3.42 for males and 4.44, 4.16, 3.29 for females respectively in descending order. This shows that CSHH has the highest means for both males and females followed by EDAT, all tending towards strong

Table 1. Osogbo residents perceptions on Sussan Wenger's building based on gender.

	Perceptions	Sex	Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)	Row total/ ground total	Mean X
1	The building is a cultural symbol and an historic heritage (CSHH)	Male	64	39	3	2	5	113	4.37
		Female	46	41	1	1	1	90	4.44
		Column total	110	80	4	3	6	203	4.41
2	The building has aesthetic value (BHAV)	Male	18	50	14	21	9	112	3.42
		Female	10	37	10	21	6	84	3.29
		Column total	28	87	24	42	15	196	3.36
3	The building has prospect for economic development and tourism (EDAT)	Male	44	44	6	4	8	105	4.06
		Female	34	42	6	4	2	88	4.16
		Column total	78	86	12	8	10	19	4.11
4	The building should be left in its current physical condition (POTB)	Male	23	31	10	23	11	107	3.30
		Female	11	24	19	35	9	89	2.92
		Column total	34	55	29	58	20	196	3.11
5	The building should be restored to its original physical condition (ROTA)	Male	23	43	19	12	9	106	3.56
		Female	21	39	10	12	5	87	3.68
		Column total	54	82	29	24	14	193	3.62
6	The building should be demolished and reconstructed (DROB)	Male	15	15	17	26	34	107	2.96
		Female	15	18	10	25	17	85	2.87
		Column total	30	33	27	51	51	192	2.92
7	The building should be converted to public use (CTPU)	Male	13	24	15	25	27	104	2.72
		Female	15	34	8	20	15	92	3.15
		Column total	28	58	23	45	42	196	2.94
8	An exact copy of the building should be constructed close to Osun Grove (as a cenotaph) (ROTB)	Male	24	39	18	16	7	104	3.55
		Female	29	39	12	8	5	93	3.85
		Column total	53	78	30	24	12	197	3.70
9	The façade of the building should be retained but internally re-arranged (FOTB)	Male	24	40	22	14	10	110	3.49
		Female	12	46	12	15	4	89	3.53
		Column total	36	86	34	29	14	199	3.51
10	The building should be converted to a museum of art and culture (CTAM)	Male	40	37	15	6	3	101	4.04
		Female	29	45	7	8	7	96	3.84
		Column total	69	82	22	14	10	197	3.94

Source: Authors' field work (2008).

Table 2. Summary of chi square, x^2 tables of Osogbo residents perceptions on Sussan Wenger's building based on gender df = 4 that is, (5-1)(2-1).

S/N	Perception	X^2_{cal}	X^2_{tab}		Remark	Inference
			P = 0.05	P = 0.01		
1	SCHH	4.57	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
2	BHAV	1.53	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
3	EDAT	3.26	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
4	POTB	9.03	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
5	ROTA	4.22	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
6	DROB	5.35	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
7	CTPU	7.31	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
8	ROTB	4.36	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
9	FOTB	7.82	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted
10	CTAM	7.12	9.49	13.28	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95% and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 1 accepted

Source: Authors' analysis (2008).

agreement with the fact that Sussan Wenger's building is a cultural symbol and an historic heritage (CSHH) that has prospect for economic development and tourism (EDAT) while the tendency towards agreeing with its hitherto aesthetic value (BHAV) abounds. This view is also supported by the summary means (X) of 4.41 (CSHH), 4.11 (EDAT) and 3.36 (BHAV) for both males and females.

Table 1 also shows the summary means (X) for both male and females on the possible conservation interventions. These include 3.94 (CTAM), 3.70 (ROTB), 3.64 (ROTA), 3.51 (FOTB), 3.11 (POTB), 2.94 (CTPU) and 2.92 (DROB) in descending order. The highest mean (X) of 3.94 for CTAM followed by 3.70 for ROTB implies that Osogbo residents agrees with the view that Sussan Wenger's Building should be converted to a museum of Art and Culture and an exact copy of the building should be constructed as a replication close to Osun groove in memory of Sussan Wenger. Such a replicate could serve as a cenotaph for the woman at her demise. The last mean (X) of 2.92 for DROB tends towards disagreeing with demolition and reconstruction of the building.

Table 2 shows the chi square (χ^2) analysis of the respondents perceptions based on gender to test the first null hypothesis (Hypothesis 1), Ho which states that "the acceptance of Sussan Wenger's building by Osogbo residents as an historic cultural heritage to be conserved does not depend on gender".

The table shows that all the three appreciation factors of CSHH, BHAV and EDAT have the calculated values of χ^2 (4.57, 1.53, 3.26 respectively) lower than the table values of χ^2 (9.49, 13.28) of degree of freedom 4 at 95% (p = 0.05) confidence level even up to 99 %(p = 0.01) confidence level respectively. Table 2 also shows that the calculated χ^2 for the seven conservation interventions 9.03 (POTB), 4.22 (ROTA), 5.35 (DROB), 7.31 (CTPU), 4.36 (ROTB), 7.82 (FOTB) and 7.12 (CTAM) are lower than the table χ^2 values 9.49 (p = 0.05), 13.28 (p = 0.01).

These implies that the Null hypothesis 1 (Ho) is accepted in each case and therefore Sussan Wenger's building is accepted by both male and female Osogbo residents as an historic heritage and cultural symbol to be conserved even though Sussan is a female.

Respondents town of origin

Table 3 shows the perceptions based on town of origin. The appreciation factors of SCHH, EDAT and BHAN have means (X) of 4.62, 4.26, 3.51 for Osogbo indigenes, 4.25, 4.00, 3.32 for Osun State but not Osogbo indigenes and 4.15, 3.94, 2.88 for others respectively in descending order. This shows that CSHH has the highest means for the three categories of town of origin followed by EDAT,

Table 3. Osogbo residents perceptions on Sussan Wenger is building based on town of origin.

	Perceptions	Town of origin	Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)	Row total / ground total	Mean X
1	The building is a cultural symbol and an historic heritage (CSHH)	Osogbo	55	24	2	1	0	82	4.62
		Osun state but not Osogbo	39	37	3	3	3	85	4.25
		Others	11	19	1	0	3	34	4.15
		Column total	105	70	6	4	6	201	4.34
2	The building has aesthetic value (BHAV)	Osogbo	14	34	9	17	3	77	3.51
		Osun state but not Osogbo	8	40	6	17	7	78	3.32
		Others	2	11	7	9	5	34	2.88
		Column total	24	85	22	43	15	189	3.23
3	The building has prospect for economic development and tourism (EDAT)	Osogbo	35	28	4	3	2	72	4.26
		Osun state but not Osogbo	31	31	8	4	5	79	4.00
		Others	7	19	6	0	1	33	3.94
		Column total	73	78	18	7	8	184	4.07
4	The building should be left in its current physical condition (POTB)	Osogbo	16	23	13	20	6	78	3.27
		Osun state but not Osogbo	13	21	12	27	7	80	3.08
		Others	6	4	7	8	5	30	2.93
		Column total	35	48	32	55	18	188	3.1
5	The building should be restored to its original physical condition (ROTA)	Osogbo	18	32	6	10	5	63	3.68
		Osun state but not Osogbo	16	33	15	7	6	77	3.60
		Others	6	14	6	3	2	31	3.61
		Column total	40	79	27	30	13	171	3.63
6	The building should be demolished and reconstructed (DROB)	Osogbo	15	22	4	25	20	75	2.76
		Osun state but not Osogbo	10	16	11	23	21	81	2.64
		Others	6	6	11	5	7	35	2.97
		Column total	31	33	26	53	48	191	2.79
7	The building should be converted to public use (CTPU)	Osogbo	12	17	9	19	13	70	3.10
		Osun state but not Osogbo	14	24	7	17	20	82	2.62
		Others	3	11	4	10	7	35	2.80
		Column total	29	52	20	46	40	187	2.84

Table 3. Contd.

8	An exact copy of the building should be constructed close to Osun Grove (as a cenotaph) (ROTB)	Osogbo	28	35	5	8	4	80	3.94
		Osun state but not Osogbo	17	30	13	9	6	75	3.57
		Others	6	14	7	5	4	36	3.36
		Column total	51	79	25	22	14	191	3.62
9	The façade of the building should be retained but internally re-arranged (FOTB)	Osogbo	17	32	8	15	3	75	3.60
		Osun state but not Osogbo	14	31	15	11	6	77	3.47
		Others	4	17	4	4	2	31	3.22
		Column total	35	80	27	30	11	183	3.43
10	The building should be converted to a museum of art and culture (CTAM)	Osogbo	32	31	5	2	4	74	4.14
		Osun state but not Osogbo	25	32	7	8	4	76	3.61
		Others	10	15	6	3	3	37	3.70
		Column total	67	78	18	13	11	187	3.82

Source: Authors' field work (2008).

all tending towards strongly agreeing with the cultural symbolism and historic heritage (CSHH) that has intrinsic value for economic development and tourism (EDAT) of the building. Table 4 also shows the mean X for conservation intervention CTAM (3.82), ROTA (3.63), ROTB (3.62), FOTB (3.43), POTB (3.10), CTPU (2.84), DROB (2.79) in descending order. This implies that conversion of the building to a museum (3.82) has the highest value which is thus the best conservation intervention for the building while demolition and reconstruction of the building are disagreed with.

Table 4 shows the χ^2 analysis of the respondents perception based on town of origin categorized into Osogbo, Osun State but not Osogbo, and others (outside Osun State). Table 3 was prepared to test the second Null hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) which states that "there is no significant relationship between Osogbo residents' perception on the cultural significance and conservation of Sussan Wenger's building and their town of origin."

From Table 4, the calculated χ^2 for BHAV (14.12), EDAT (13.13), POTB (6.47), ROTA (8.48), DROB (17.37), CTPU (4.88), ROTB (10.89), FOTB (6.27), CTAM (8.09) are lower than the table value of χ^2 (20.09) at 99% (p = 0.01) confidence level for degree of freedom (df) 8.

This implies an acceptance of the Null hypothesis 2 for all the perception factors at 99% confidence level except CSHH. The calculated χ^2 value for CSHH (22.11) is greater than the table value for CSHH (20.09) at 99% confidence level. This implies a rejection of the Null hypothesis 2 for CSHH. Therefore, Osogbo indigenes attached more cultural significance to the building than residents from other towns of origin. The incidence of this is not strange. Rapport (1977: 317) asserts that people's responses to environments partly depend on where they grew up or come from and deduced this fact from Pyron (1971) and Wohlwill and Kohn (1973).

Respondents rate of observing the building

Table 5 shows the four rates of observing the building. These include daily, weekly, monthly, yearly. The CSHH mean (X) values for these rates are 4.57, 4.52, 4.59, 4.18 respectively. This implies tendencies towards strongly agreeing that Sussan Wenger's building is a cultural symbol and historic heritage (CSHH) irrespective of the rate of observation. Table 5 also shows the means (X) as 4.72 (CSHH), 4.26 (EDAT), 4.00 (CTAM), 3.60 (ROTA), 3.51 (FOTB), 3.47 (ROTB), 3.46 (BHAV), 3.06 (POTB), 2.95 (CTPU), 2.71 (DROB) in descending order. The high mean (X) value of 4.26 for EDAT tends toward strongly agreeing that the building has prospect for economic development and tourism, 4.00 for CTAM implies agreeing that the building should be converted to a museum, while the low value of 2.71 for DROB indicates unequivocal disagreement with demolition and reconstruction of the building

Table 4. Summary of chi square, x^2 tables of Osogbo residents perceptions on Sussan Wenger's building based on respondents town of origin. df = 8, that is, (5-1)(3-1)

S/N	Perception	X^2_{cal}	X^2_{tab} P = 0.05	X^2_{tab} P = 0.01	Remark	Inference
1	SCHH	22.11	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
2	BHAV	14.12	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
3	EDAT	13.13	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
4	POTB	6.47	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
5	ROTA	8.48	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
6	DROB	17.37	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
7	CTPU	4.88	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
8	ROTB	10.89	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
9	FOTB	6.27	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted
10	CTAM	8.09	15.51	20.09	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 2 accepted

Source: Authors' analysis (2008).

Table 5. Osogbo residents perceptions on Sussan Wenger's building based on rate of observation.

	Perceptions	Rate of observation	Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)	Row total/ ground total	Mean X
1	The building is a cultural symbol and an historic heritage (CSHH)	Daily	46	12	1	3	1	63	4.57
		Weekly	17	16	0	0	0	33	4.52
		Monthly	22	15	0	0	0	37	4.59
		Yearly	18	22	2	2	1	45	4.18
		Column total	103	65	3	5	2	178	4.72
2	The building has aesthetic value (BHAV)	Daily	9	27	7	12	5	60	3.38
		Weekly	7	21	2	8	1	39	3.64
		Monthly	6	14	5	10	2	37	3.32
		Yearly	7	19	8	11	0	45	3.49
		Column total	29	81	22	41	8	181	3.46
3	The building has prospect for economic development and tourism (EDAT)	Daily	26	20	3	2	0	51	4.37
		Weekly	16	18	0	0	0	34	4.47
		Monthly	17	13	3	2	0	40	4.29
		Yearly	15	18	4	3	3	43	3.91
		Column total	74	69	10	7	3	163	4.26

Table 5. Contd.

4	The building should be left in its current physical condition (POTB)	Daily	15	10	9	13	7	54	3.24
		Weekly	7	14	6	12	0	39	3.41
		Monthly	8	10	10	8	3	39	3.31
		Yearly	3	9	7	8	7	34	2.26
		Column total	33	43	32	41	17	166	3.06
5	The building should be restored to its original physical condition (ROTA)	Daily	15	24	6	4	6	55	3.69
		Weekly	4	18	4	3	2	31	3.61
		Monthly	8	7	7	4	2	28	3.54
		Yearly	9	17	8	6	3	43	3.53
		Column total	36	66	25	17	13	157	3.60
6	The building should be demolished and reconstructed (DROB)	Daily	15	8	4	6	19	52	2.88
		Weekly	2	3	4	23	5	37	2.29
		Monthly	4	8	4	14	6	36	2.72
		Yearly	9	11	6	9	11	46	2.96
		Column total	30	30	18	52	41	171	2.71
7	The building should be converted to public use (CTPU)	Daily	12	13	9	8	15	57	2.98
		Weekly	6	9	8	13	5	41	2.95
		Monthly	3	10	6	7	9	35	2.74
		Yearly	6	20	2	11	8	47	3.11
		Column total	27	52	25	39	37	180	2.95
8	An exact copy of the building should be constructed close to Osun Grove (as a cenotaph) (ROTB)	Daily	15	24	6	5	4	54	3.76
		Weekly	12	13	4	5	2	36	3.94
		Monthly	4	9	6	4	5	28	3.11
		Yearly	12	15	7	9	4	47	3.47
		Column total	43	61	23	23	15	165	
9	The façade of the building should be retained but internally re-arranged (FOTB)	Daily	12	16	8	6	5	47	3.51
		Weekly	8	18	5	7	2	40	3.58
		Monthly	9	15	8	4	2	38	3.66
		Yearly	6	20	6	9	5	46	3.28
		Column total	35	69	27	26	14	171	3.51

Table 5. Contd.

10	The building should be converted to a Museum of Art and Culture (CTAM)	Daily	20	23	5	2	4	54	3.98
		Weekly	17	13	4	4	1	39	4.05
		Monthly	12	18	3	1	3	37	3.95
		Yearly	16	19	5	5	1	46	3.96
		Column total	65	73	17	12	9	176	4.00

Source: Authors' field work (2008).

Table 6. Summary of chi square, X^2 tables of Osogbo residents perceptions on Sussan Wenger's building based on rate of observation: df = 12, that is, (5-1)(4-1).

S/N	Perception	X^2_{cal}	X^2_{tab} P = 0.05	X^2_{tab} P = 0.01	Remark	Inference
1	SCHH	23.64	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} > X^2_{tab}$ at 95%; $X^2_{cal} < X^2$ Tab at 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
2	BHAV	9.12	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
3	EDAT	17.38	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
4	POTB	15.52	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
5	ROTA	10.98	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
6	DROB	38.16	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
7	CTPU	17.09	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
8	ROTB	12.79	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
9	FOTB	7.11	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels	Null hypothesis 3 accepted
10	CTAM	9.86	21.03	26.22	$X^2_{cal} < X^2_{tab}$ at both 95 and 99% confidence levels.	Null hypothesis 3 accepted

Source: Authors' analysis (2008).

irrespective of rate of observation. The mean (X) values of 3.60 for ROTB and 3.51 for FOTB implies tending towards agreeing that an exact copy of the building should be constructed close to Osun Grove and a conservation intervention of facadism could be carried out on the existing building. A survey of Table 5 generally suggests that response does not depend on rate of observation of the building.

Table 6 shows the chi square (χ^2) analysis value of the perception based on rate of observation of the building to test the third Null hypothesis, Ho 3 which states that "the rate of observation of Sussan Wenger's building by Osogbo residents has no influence on their perception of the cultural significance and conservation of the building."

The table shows that CSHH, BHAV and EDAT have the calculated chi square, χ^2 values of 23.64,

9.12 and 17.38 respectively lower than the table value of χ^2 (26.22) at 99% (P= 0.01) confidence level for degree of freedom (df) 12. Table 6 also shows that the calculated χ^2 of 15.52 (POTB), 10.98 (ROTA), 17.09 (CTPU), 12.79 (ROTB), 7.11 (FOTB) and 9.86 (CTAM) are lower than the table χ^2 values 21.03 (p = 0.05), 26.22 (p = 0.01). The implication of these is that the Null hypothesis 3 is accepted in each case and that the building is

perceived as a cultural symbol and historic heritage for conservation. However, Table 6 shows that χ^2 calculated for DROB (38.16) is greater than the table values of 21.03 (p = 0.05), 26.22 (p = 0.01). This implies that the rate of observation has influence on the perception factor, demolition and reconstruction (DROB) of the building but the mean (X) of DROB, 2.71 already tends towards disagreeing with this conservation factor.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study has discovered that Osogbo residents perceive Sussan Wenger's building as a cultural symbol and historic heritage to be conserved. The study also discovered that the best conservation intervention perceived for the building is conversion to a Museum and Tourist Centre. This could be a museum of art and culture. The need for the construction of a replica of the building at Osun Grove, which could possibly be a cenotaph for Sussan Wenger was also discovered. This is necessary considering the association between her works on the building and at the Osun Grove and her roles in the enlisting of Osun Sacred Grove as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It is recommended that UNESCO should attach as much significance to Sussan Wenger's building as to the Osun Sacred Grove and therefore see to its routine maintenance and conservation.

REFERENCES

Ahmad AG (2006). Cultural heritage of Southeast Asia: preservation for world recognition. J. Malaysian Town Plan, 3(1): 52-62.
Braines F (1923). Preservation of ancient moments and historic buildings. RIBA J., 4(22): 104–106.
British Standards Institution (BSI) (1998). Guide to the principles of the conservation of historic buildings. BS 7913, London: BSI.
Carmona M, Heath Tim, Oc T, Tiesdell S (2003). Public places-urban spaces. The dimensions of urban design. Oxford: Architectural Press
Falade SA (2000). The comprehensive history of Osogbo, Ibadan: Tunji Owolabi Commercial Printers, pp. 1-4, 67.
Feilden BM (1994). Conservation of historic buildings. 2nd edition Oxford: Butterworth Heineman.
Freeman H (1984) (ed.). Mental health and environment. Great Britain: Churchill Living Stone.
Lynch K (1972b). What time is this place? In Carmona M, Heath T, Oc T and Tiesdell S (2003). Public places-urban spaces: The dimensions of urban design. Oxford: Architectural Press, pp. 197-199.
Mason P , Cheyne J (2000) Residents' attitudes to Proposed Tourism Development. Ann. Tourism Res., 27(2): 391-411.
Ndaruga AM, Irwin PR (2003). Cultural perceptions of wetlands by primary school teachers in Kenya. Int. Res. Geogr. Environ. Educ., 12(3): 219-230.
Okpoko PU, Okonkwo E (2005). Heritage management and tourism in the Obudu Cattle Rauch and Sukur Kingdom, Nigeria. CRM: The J. Heritage Stewardsh., 2(2). Summer.
Punter J (1996). Developments in urban design review: the lessons of West Coast cities of the United State for British Practise (eds.) Oc T and Tiesdell S. J. Urban Des., 1(1): 28.

Prentice R (1993). Tourism and heritage attraction. London: Routedge. p. 5.
Productivity Commission (2005). Conservation of Australia's historic heritage places. Draft Report.
Pyron B (1971). Form and space diversity in human habitats: Perceptual responses. In Rapoport, A (ed.) Human aspects of urban form: Towards a man-environment approach to urban form and design. Environ. Behav., 3(2): 382-411.
Rapoport A (1977). Human aspects of urban form: Towards a man-environment approach to urban form and design. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 317-322.
Resources Planning and Development Commission,Tasmania, RPDC (2003) Assessment of the Macquarie Harbour Penal Station's social and contemporary significance. Downloaded from http://soer.justice.tas.gov.au/2003/her/issue/103/index.php on February 2, 2009.
South African National Parks (SANParks) (2006). Heritage significance and vulnerability assessment of Tokai and Cecilia. Report downloaded from www.sanparks.org/parks/table-mountain/ library/documents.php on February 2, 2009.
Spennemann DHR (1992). World War II remains on Central Pacific Islands: Perceptions of heritage versus priorities of preservation. Pac. Rev., 5(3): 278-290.
Spennemann DHR , Harris K (1996). Cultural heritage of Culcaim Shire: Some considerations for strategic planning. Johnstone Centre of Parks, Recreation and Heritage Report 71 Albury: Charles Sturt University.
Spennemann DHR, Lockwood M, Harries K (2001). The eye of the professional vs. opinion of the community. Cult. Resour. Manage., 24(2): 16-18.
Spennemann DHR (2003). Teacher and student perceptions of the cultural heritage of the CNMI: An empirical snap-shot. Micronesian J. Humanities and Social Sciences. 2(1-2):50-57 Albury: Letao publishing.
Stephenson J, Bauchop H, Petchey P (2004). Bannockburn heritage landscape study. New Zealand: Department of Conservation. Downloaded from www.rmaguide.org.nz/content/document/ Bannockburn%20.pdf on February 2, 2009.
Thomas M (2002). Moving landscapes: National Parks and the Vietnamese experience; studies in the cultural construction of open space. Sydney NSW: National Parks and Wildlife Service.
Tiesdell S, Oc T, Heath T (1996). Revitalizing historic urban quarters. Oxford: Butterworths in Carmona M, Heath T, Oc T and Tiesdell S (2003). Public place - urban spaces: The dimensions of urban design. Oxford: Architectural Press.
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (1972). Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage: Adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session. Paris, 16 November, pp. 1-2.