TRADITIONAL VERSUS DIALOGIC TEACHING-STUDENT INTERACTION AND STUDENTS PERFORMANCE IN RECALL IN BUSINESS EDUCATION IN UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA

Dr. Sampson Owazuaka Wagbara & Ewarawon, Ulisan
Department of Business Education, Faculty of Education
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

sampsonwagbara@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study examined the effect of dialogic teaching on teacher-student interaction and students' performance in Business Education in Universities in south-south Nigeria. The study adopted a quasi-experimental design (pretest and posttest of non-equivalent control group). Two groups were established, the Control and Experimental group. The Control group received no treatment while the Experimental group was administered the treatment of 'Dialogic Teaching'. The population of the study consisted of 114 final year students of Delta State University and University of Benin. The sample size of 36 students was selected using non-random sampling technique, Purposive. Achievement Test was designed to elicit the performance of students after the intervention programme. The Achievement Test DTATBES consisted of 48 question items. The hypotheses were tested with Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) at 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed that male and female (Gender differentiation) students exposed to dialogic teaching performed better than male and female students exposed to traditional teaching. That is the experimental group (dialogic) performance statistically differs significantly from the control group (traditional). The study therefore recommended that tertiary institutions, business schools, school administrators and business educators need to incorporate dialogic teaching in business courses in undergraduate and postgraduate programmes that require explorative and collaborative team work among students.

Keywords: Traditional Dialogic, Teaching-Student Interaction, Students Performance

INTRODUCTION

Vocational and technical schools in Nigeria provide a specialty area for business education. Business education as an instructional programme includes two elements: a vocational programme of office careers through initial, refresher and upgrading education; and a general business education programme to provide students with the information and competencies needed by everyone in managing their personal business affairs and using the business services of the business world (Ajisafe, Bolarinwa & Edeh, 2015). It offers office education in office information management (formally called secretarial education or office technology and management), accounting, marketing, and management.

It is the major objective of business education to generate business instructors, office managers, and entrepreneurs who are capable, skilled, and energetic in the workplace. Entrepreneurship and self-employment are the primary goals of business education, which is focused on educating students for positions or careers in organisations as workers and employers. It also necessitates cultivating a creative mindset in business education. For the last decade, this facet of innovation has been garnering attention. Business education may foster creativity in students by using instructional strategies that encourage students to think beyond the box.

Business education, due to its peculiar nature of it being an essential input to the Nigerian economy, business and organizations, from time to time, experiences the need for change or

innovations. One of such change is teaching delivery and information and communication facilities. There is a need to introduce or modify the method of conducting business education, most especially in those courses that demands students' deep reflection of concepts and having grips with or touch with reality. Ajisafe et al. (2015) emphasized that the success and survival of business education constantly depend on its ability to adapt and keep pace with the needs of its recipients. These changes present challenges for both the learner and instructor (business educator). Nevertheless, the business educator must be willing to adapt and manage these challenges to ensure successful programs for the future. The needs of recipients of business education programmes occasion the crucial changes that need a response in method, delivery, facilities assessment, research, and personnel.

This research stands to affirm or disprove the claims objectively through its scientific inquiry. However, Howe and Abedin (2013) opined that the educational achievement in terms of students' performance is an all-embracing one such that academic, business and social aspects of the students are improved. The outcome of dialogic teaching-learning could be conceptual knowledge, technical skills, analytical skills, problem-solving skills, creative skills, entrepreneurial skills, social skills, communication skills, emotional skills (self-esteem and self-confidence), among others. It becomes expedient to consider dialogic teaching as an additional teaching pedagogy to business education program.

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance ($P < 0.05$).

H_{o1} There is no significant difference between the mean score in Recall of Concepts of Business Education students who were exposed to teacher-student interaction and who were exposed to traditional teaching in universities in south-south Nigeria.

H_{o2} There is no significant difference between the mean score in Recall of Concepts of Business Education students who were exposed to student-student interaction and those who were exposed to traditional teaching in universities in south-south Nigeria.

H_{o3} There is no significant difference between the mean score in Recall of Concepts of Business Education students who were exposed to student-teacher interaction and who were exposed to traditional teaching in universities in south-south Nigeria.

Concept of Teaching

Explaining the term teaching for which pedagogy is required, Stellebosch University (2013) stated that teaching can be defined as engagement with learners to enable their understanding and application of knowledge, concept, and processes. It includes design, content selection, delivery, assessment, and reflection. To teach is to engage students in learning; thus, teaching involves getting students involved in the active construction of knowledge. To be an effective teacher, one must have a thorough understanding of both the subject matter and the learning styles of the students they will be working with. Educators want their students to become active creators of their own and others' knowledge, not just passive receivers of that knowledge. In order for a teacher to grow, he or she needs the help of the student.

Creating the intellectual, social, and ethical circumstances for students to take responsibility for their own and each other's education is central to the work of teachers everywhere (Stellebosch University, 2013). Merriam-Dictionary Webster's similarly describes education as study, practice, instruction, or experiences are all ways of acquiring knowledge or competence

It has been said that teaching entails the instructor presenting material to students in a methodical and sequential manner (Amadi & Akpan 2017). A systematic approach to teaching is one in which lessons are delivered according to a set of rules. In other terms, it refers to the way of transferring knowledge. It includes the lesson goals, a review of the previous lesson, a presentation of the idea from known to unknown, a summary, revision questions, and assignments or class work. The goals of the lesson plan must be in line with the activities that take place in the classroom. The notion to be taught informs the goals of the lesson. It is important to keep in mind not just what the

teacher want to teach but also how the teacher want to teach it. The goals of a lesson serve as a guide for assessing a teacher's efficacy as well as the understanding, behaviour, and performance of students.
The teaching-learning process is guided by lesson goals. The preceding lesson is revisited in order to expand on what was learned before. In other words, each new lesson builds on the preceding one. To avoid students forgetting or just comprehending in part what they learned in the prior class, it is vital to have them go over what they learned to make sure they understand the new material. The modification, however, will improve clarity and comprehension. Teacher-student interaction occurs in the classroom when a skilled educator imparts information and skills to students.

Teacher (Educator)-Student Interaction
Students' learning, socialisation, and growth are not only based on their interactions with instructors, (Davidson, (1981) in Kerem & Cihan, 2020). In a teacher-student interaction, there is a mutual exchange between the instructor and students. The instructor begins the dialogue class with a lesson-related discussion. An important part of a teacher's job is to explain the lesson subject in a manner that students can understand. Students' understanding of the subject will show a shift in their behaviour at this point (Kerem & Cihan, 2020). In a teacher-student interaction, the instructor acts as a facilitator of classroom discussion (Viiri & Saari, 2006 in Owodunni, 2015). Students are expected to adapt to the course topic and build cognitive, emotional, psychomotor, and social abilities by asking questions throughout the lecture presentation. Students' answers to the teacher's questions are listened to by the educator.

Owodunni (2015) believes that at this level, students require adjustment and learning to deal with intellectual, social, emotional, and motor demands in classrooms. The teacher's inquiries elicited these discussions. Teachers and students are constantly responding to changes in the environment via remarks and statements as part of a dynamic process of teacher-student interaction. Teachers and students develop closer bonds as a result of the patterns of behaviour they exhibit when confronted with a new situation or situational challenge. As a result, the degree of teacher-student contact is influenced by the classroom environment. Students are able to change their learning habits because of this contingency (Mercer & Sam, 2006, Kosir & Tement, 2014, Pennings et al., 2018).

Students that have a solid teacher-student relationship are less likely to be unfriendly, hostile, or dissatisfied. At this level, the teacher's job is to help students learn how to connect socially while also helping them succeed academically. According to Gehlbach et al (2016), students who have a favourable view of their instructor are more likely to succeed in their studies. Students' perceptions of the instructor's conduct, according to Tyler and Boelter (2018), are a significant factor in the interaction process. Masten (1994) and Baker (1999) in Kerem and Cihan, (2020), in the classroom, students who believe their instructor is uncooperative are less engaged and less likely to participate in the discussion. Interaction at this level, according to, is beneficial because it encourages students to become more adaptable and capable. Furthermore, they highlighted that students' learning comes through an open and free exchange with the instructor. When it comes to dialogic learning the most important variable is not the student but the instructor who has high expectations for their students and gives them with more possibilities (Whitaker, 2014 in Hussain et al., 2019). When it comes to engaging students in meaningful conversation, the teacher is usually the one who makes the first move. What happens if instructors do not have an emotional connection to their students? Because of this, it is feasible that the effect on students' thoughts is nothing. Students are encouraged to utilise their energy and drive to accomplish the intended educational or performance objective through the teacher's positive culture of engagement and healthy teamwork. High levels of curiosity and interest in learning are fostered in this kind of

atmosphere. Students become enthusiastic participants in their own learning (Maulana et al., 2017).

Teacher influence on student academic progress has been shown by Christiansen (2016) in Hussain et al. (2019). Positive student-teacher interactions have been cited as a crucial component of student performance success. The learning environment is influenced by the relationship between the instructor and students, according to Hussain et al. (2019). The speed and cadence of the dialogic class are determined by the teacher-student interaction, which sets the scene for the student-student engagement.

Evaluation of Students' Performance

The information, skills, and abilities that a student should have and being able to display the completion of a learning experience or series of learning experiences are referred to as learning outcome or performance (Boston University, 2017). The term student performance is used to refer to what is expected of students or what the teachers want the students to accomplish. It is the real performance that students accomplish or fail to attain during their time in school or later in life that are taken into consideration. The performance of students may be broken down into three categories. The first kind of performance is termed the learning performance, and it focuses on the learning goals or standards of a particular school or programme. The second factor is the educational performance of the institutions as well as the social performance of the graduates that are anticipated.

The major focus of this investigation is on the performance of students in their educational endeavours. The learning performance includes a teaching component as well. The performance of the information, abilities, and attitude to work that students are expected to gain by the time they reach the conclusion of an educational period is defined, either by the instructor or by the school (semester, session, cumulative period, etc.). Learning performance are defined in a manner that is both clear and explicit, outlining both what students should know (concept and skill) and be able to do (skill application, create ideas), as well as what and how to do things (problem-solving and creative). Therefore, over the course of the learning experience, the instructor will periodically define instructional objectives for the class. A dialogic classroom allows for the establishment of educational as well as collaborative objectives. Scores obtained on standardised examinations are considered to be outcomes for students. Due to the fact that it is derived from education-specific outcomes, student accomplishment is also considered to be a student outcome (Glossary of Education Reform, 2021).

The learning objectives that are intended for the dialogic class should be goals that can really be achieved. During the time that the class is really being held, the learning result or performance may be evaluated in relation to the students' developmental stages, abilities, entrance behaviours, and skill sets, as well as the amount of time that is actually available for the class. It is important to keep in mind that the result that is established by the instructor need to coincide with the content that is really being taught. The outcomes for students that were designed by the instructor or the student themselves should be mentioned in the actual performance of the students. In order for learning outcomes to be quantified, they need to be both active and observable. When the programme has been successfully completed, students should be able to exhibit or generate the desired result. This should be the focus of the outcome. Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive, psychomotor, and emotional abilities is one of the structural frameworks that may be used to structure learning outcomes. This taxonomy is often used in the process of sketching out the objectives for students. Verbs are used to describe the results for students. The objectives for students should be designed in such a way that the data that is available may be collected, arranged, and assessed (method and technical consideration of outcome).

Over the years, researchers have focused on various student outcomes such as achievement, higher-level reasoning, retention, time on task, transfer of learning, achievement motivation,

intrinsic motivation, social and cognitive development, moral reasoning, perspective-taking, interpersonal attraction, social support, friendships, reduction of stereotypes and prejudice, valuing differences, self-esteem social competencies, internalisation of values, the quality of the education received, and the quantity of the students who drop out of high school (Herman, 2008 in Harati, 2012).

After being presented with learning experience that is geared toward achieving the learning goals that have been established, a student's performance or result refers to the student's reaction to questions, observations, and action exercises. According to the opinions of Narad and Abdullah (2016), as presented in Abaidoo (2018), academic performance is the information learned that is measured by marks by a teacher and or educational objectives established by students and instructors to be accomplished over a specified period of time. They went on to say that tests of accomplishment, either in the form of continuous assessment or examination, are used to determine whether or not these objectives have been met. The Bloom Taxonomy is a well-known paradigm that may be used to evaluate the progress that students have made over time.

Benjamin Samuel Bloom created what is now known as the Bloom's Taxonomy. The Bloom's Taxonomy is a categorization system that is extensively used in educational institutions to identify and differentiate between distinct levels of human cognition in areas of thinking, learning, comprehending, remembering, and applying information. Educators typically make use of Bloom's taxonomy in order to inform or guide the development of assessments (evaluations of student learning – observation, test, and examination), curriculum (units, lessons, projects, and other learning activities), and instructional methods such as questioning strategies, dialogic strategies, and so on (Forehand, 2010).

Teacher-Students Interaction and Performance

Teacher-student interaction, as proposed by Maleka et al. (2021), should be considered an important educational concept. Success in class has a direct impact on how well students are able to retain information, develop new learning strategies, and attain academic goals. Having teacher-student interactions focus on student learning is an important part of helping students achieve their learning goals when using a learner-centered approach (Cornelius-White, 2007 in Li & Yang, 2021). Teachers and students' interactions have a substantial impact on student learning results (Zhang, 2019; Li & Yang, 2021). As a result, Li and Yang (2021) claim that students' academic and social achievement are linked when teachers and students engage actively. According to Li and Yang, classroom interactions between teachers and students increase students' interest and enthusiasm for studying.

According to Howe (2020), classroom discussion between instructors and students is a hot topic in research studies that focus on interactions in small groups. In several researches, teachers and students were tested to see whether they were engaging in fruitful dialogic teaching. It is impossible to separate the contribution made by such discourse from other factors like prior experience or age, even when the findings are favourable. A small number of participants is required to conduct this kind of study, which results in a restricted number of possible outcomes. Consideration might be given as to whether or not all of the target discourse patterns are fruitful.

Constructivism Theory

This study considered the Cognitive Constructivism theory of Piaget Jean and Social Constructivism theory of Vygostky. Constructivism theory is linked to Piaget Jean's theory of cognitive development (1896 – 1934). Constructivism is the theory that explains how individuals come to have the beliefs they have. Constructivism is an educational paradigm that serves as a foundation for classroom learning. Learners generate new ideas or concepts based on their present or previous knowledge. Using a cognitive framework, a learner picks and changes information, formulates hypotheses, and makes judgments. Cognition (i.e., schema, mental models) lends meaning and order to events, allowing the person to move beyond the information provided. Business

instructors urge students to uncover concepts on their own as a means of enhancing their understanding of the material. It is important for the teacher and the student to have a conversation. The teacher's job is to adapt the content to the student's present level of comprehension.

According to this theory, students build their knowledge of the world by engaging in hands-on activities and then reflecting on their experiences. Students' capacity to actively develop their knowledge in relation to reality in business education is mostly dependent on the experiences of the learners (business students). It is the teacher (the business educator) that creates the majority of these events, giving an engaging and exploratory experience, an active atmosphere for interaction and inquiry as well as self-evaluation.

McLeod (2019) said that constructivism believes in personal production of meaning by the learner via experience, and that meaning is modified by the interplay of existing knowledge and new experiences. The major emphasis of cognitive constructivism is the learner (business education students). Individual students' understanding and reinterpretation of previously taught or encountered material, as well as the impact of such experiences on one another, are fundamental concerns of constructivism. This concept harmonises with Dialogic learning, both in and out of the classroom, as it encourages students to explore their own pace of study and self-discovery. In the same way, dialogic learning encourages students to devote more time and effort to reinforcing what they have learned. Students, instructors, and teachers and students will be able to communicate in a dialogic classroom environment for business education students. Students should be encouraged to apply their knowledge of concepts and abilities to the world around them as part of a constructivist education. Consequently, cognitive theory emphasises is on students' active engagement in experience and knowledge via collaborative and exploratory attitudes.

METHODOLOGY

Experiments were conducted using a quasi-experimental design. A total of 114 final year students from the Delta State University affiliate programme at the College of Education Warri in Delta State and the University of Benin in Edo State participated in the research. 46 students from the Delta State University affiliate programme and 68 students from University of Benin. The school's business education department's course counsellors provided this data. A sample size of 36 students was purposefully chosen from the final year class of 114 students in order to efficiently manage the class and assess the effects. In order to assess the effects of the independent variable and other variables on the dependent variable, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA - One-Way Analysis of Covariance) was employed to test the null hypotheses at a 0.05 level of significance using scores from the pre-test and post-tests. The null hypothesis with a p-value higher than 0.05 was accepted, whereas the null hypothesis with a p-value less than or equal to 0.05 was rejected. Respondents' responses were analysed using SPSS (statistical package for social science) software version 23. The Moderating variable was examined with Pearson Product Movement Correlation.

Results

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the mean score in Recall of Concepts of Business Education Students who were exposed to teacher-student interaction and who were exposed to traditional teaching.

Traditional vs Dialogic Teaching and Students Performance in Recall
Traditional vs Dialogic Teaching (Teacher-Student Interaction) and Students Performance in Recall

Test of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable Post-test Business Education Achievement Score

Source		Df		F	Sig.		Observed	Decision

	Type III Sum of Squares		Mean Square			Partial Eta Squared	Power[b]	
Corrected Model	814.733[a]	2	814.733	16.148	.000	.495		
Intercept	1849.621	1	1849.621	73.319	.000	.690		
Pretest	270.288	1	270.288	10.714	.002	.245		
Exp Group	814.080	1	814.080	32.270	.000	.494		Significant
Error	832.490	33	25.227					
Total	328450.000	36						
Corrected Total	1647.222	35						

a. R Squared = .495 (Adjusted R Squared = .464)

b. Computed using alpha = .05

The information shown on Table above at 2-tailed test to determine if there is no significant difference between the mean scores in recall of concepts of Business Education students taught with teacher-student interaction and those taught with the traditional teaching method revealed that there was a significant main effect of the treatment in students' performance scores, F (1, 35) = 32.270, p(0.000) < 0.05. Based on the findings of p-value is less than the level of significance, the null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference between students' mean score in recall of concepts of Business Education Students taught with teacher-student interaction and those taught with the traditional method. The degree of teacher-student interaction effect on students' performance showed (Eta value x 100) 49.5% based on the model and from the experimental group 49.4%. The study also revealed a correlation coefficient of .46 which implies that there is a positive and moderate relationship between teacher-student interaction and students' performance. That students' performance is positively related to dialogic teaching-learning process. The mean score for teacher-student interaction (99.17) differ significantly from the mean score (91.39) of Traditional teaching. This implies that, the dialogic teaching group with teacher-students interaction performed well above their counterparts (traditional teaching) in recall and retention.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the mean score in Recall of concepts of Business Education students who were exposed to student-student interaction and who were exposed to traditional teaching.

Traditional vs Dialogic Teaching (Student-Student Interaction) and Students Performance in Recall

Test of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable Post-test Business Education Achievement Score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power[b]	Decision
Corrected Model	5463.566[a]	2	2731.783	97.205	.000	.855		
Intercept	342.107	1	342.107	12.173	.001	.269		
Pretest	4296.204	1	4296.204	152.872	.000	.822		
Exp Group	2694.197	1	2694.197	95.868	.000	.744		Significant
Error	927.407	33	28.103					
Total	245675.000	36						
Corrected Total	6390.972	35						

a. R Squared = .855 (Adjusted R Squared = .846)

b. Computed using alpha = .05

The findings on if there is no significant difference between the mean scores in recall of concepts of Business Education students taught with student-student interaction and those taught with the traditional teaching method revealed that there is a significant main effect of the treatment in students' performance scores, F (1, 35) = 95.86, p(0.000) < 0.05. Based on the findings of p-value is less than the level of significance, the null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference between students' mean score in recall of concepts of Business Education Students taught with student-student interaction and those taught with the traditional method. The degree of student-student interaction effect on students' performance showed (Eta value x 100) 85.5% based on the model and from the experimental group 74.4%. The study also revealed a correlation coefficient of .846 which implies that there is a positive and very strong relationship between student-student interaction and students' performance. That students' performance is positively related to dialogic teaching-learning process. The mean score for student-student interaction (87.22) differ significantly from the mean score (75.83) of Traditional teaching. This implies that, the dialogic teaching group with student-students interaction performed well above their counterparts (traditional teaching) in recall and retention.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the mean score in Recall of Concepts of Business Education Students who were exposed to student-teacher interaction and who were exposed to traditional teaching.

Traditional vs Dialogic Teaching (Student-Teacher Interaction) and Students Performance in Recall

Test of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable Post-test Business Education Achievement Score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power[b]	Decision
Corrected Model	14462.657[a]	2	7231.328	101.045	.000	.860		
Intercept	76.581	1	76.581	1.070	.308	.031		
Pretest	11528.629	1	11528.629	161.093	.000	.830		
Exp Group	2428.401	1	2428.401	33.933	.000	.507		Significant
Error	2361.649	33	71.565					
Total	205325.000	36						
Corrected Total	16824.306	35						

a. R Squared = .860 (Adjusted R Squared = .851)

b. Computed using alpha = .05

The findings on if there is no significant difference between the mean scores in recall of concepts of Business Education students taught with student-teacher interaction and those taught with the traditional teaching method revealed that there was a significant main effect of the treatment in students' performance scores, F (1, 35) = 39.93, p (0.000) < 0.05. Based on the findings of p-value is less than the level of significance, the null hypothesis was therefore rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference between students' mean score in recall of concepts of Business Education Students taught with student-teacher interaction and those taught with the traditional method. The degree of student-teacher interaction effect on students' performance showed (Eta value x 100) 86% based on the model and from the experimental group 51%. The study also revealed a correlation coefficient of .85 which implies that there is a positive and very strong relationship between student-teacher interaction and students' performance. That students' performance is positively related to dialogic teaching-learning process. The mean score for student-teacher interaction (81.33) differ significantly from the mean score (63.33) of Traditional

teaching. This implies that, the dialogic teaching group with student-teacher interaction performed well above their counterparts (traditional teaching) in recall and retention.

Discussion of Findings

Traditional vs Dialogic Teaching and Students Performance in Recall

Hypotheses one, two, and three were likewise put to the test. For these questions, the Achievement Test's Part B item 1-4 (involving teacher-student interaction), 17-20 (involving student-student interaction), and 32-35 (student-teacher interaction) were meticulously created to answer the following questions: There were mean differences of 7.78 (SD = 8.61) for research question 1, 11.39 (SD = 19.99) for research question 2, and 19.17 (SD = 28.4) for research question 3, respectively, in the results of the experiment. The ancova results in Table 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12 are F(1, 35) = 32.27 p-value of .000, F(1, 35) = 95.86 p-value of .000 and F(1, 35) = 33.93 p-value .000. The results are positive and significant at 0.05 alpha. Thus, there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypotheses (Ho_1, Ho_2 and Ho_3) while retaining the alternatives (Ha_1, Ha_2, Ha_3). This implies that there is significant difference between the performance score of students exposed to dialogic teaching (teacher-student, student-student and student-teacher interaction) and traditional teaching in recall/retention.

This research findings is in agreement with Diane and Milton's (2003) assertion that retaining information over the long term needs processing it in such a manner that we shift concepts from short-term to long-term memory, and fit these new ideas in with what we already know (or believe we know). Dialogic education helps students remember and internalise concepts by using a variety of teaching methods. Students with poor memory and slow learners may be helped to imprint a lifelong learning habit in their minds via the conversation process, teamwork, or exploration. As a result, the physical presentation, exploration, and engagement in the classroom serves as a foundation for remembering certain key knowledge. Thorn (2006) also states that students are expected to both study and show the mastery of this information on a weekly basis. When a learner grasps the significance, importance, and application of a topic, it sticks in his or her mind and memory. Recalling what you have learned is a way to show that you have mastered what you have learned. Recall is the ability to recall something from the past. Demonstrating or reiterating previously learned information and skills.

CONCLUSION

Based on the objectives of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

The primary goal of business education is to produce competent, skillful and dynamic business teachers, office administrators and entrepreneurs that will effectively compete in the world of work. It requires preparing business students for roles or career in organisations and self employment, and developing the attitude and spirit of creativity in business education. Creativity and analytical abilities in business education can be stimulated in students through the adoption of teaching method that engenders the desired outcome.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations have been made to facilitate the implementation of dialogic teaching in tertiary institutions.

1. It is recommended that the Association of Business Education of Nigeria both at the state and national body should objectively study the teaching-learning process of dialogic teaching.
2. The Association and business educators should carry out research studies on the challenges and how to manage dialogic class session so as to achieve its desired outcome.
3. Business educators should be trained on the use of dialogic teaching in classroom and also develop the right attitude towards student disposition most especially at the student-student interaction and student-teacher interaction.

4. Tertiary institutions, business schools, School administrators and business educators need to consider incorporating dialogic teaching in business courses that require explorative and collaborative team work among students.

REFERENCES

Ajisafe, O.E, Bolarinwa, K.O., & Edeh, T. (2015). Issues in Business Education Programme: Challenges to National Transformation . *Journal of Education and Practice*. 6(21), 208 – 213.

Amadi, G., & Akpan, K.P. (2017). Influence of student-teacher communication on students' academic achievement for effective teaching and learning. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5(10), 1102-1107

Abaidoo, A. (2018*). Factors contributing to the academic performance of students in junior high schools*. *https://www.grin.com*.

Diane, H., & Milton, H. (2003). Applying the science of learning to the university and beyond. *Change*, 35(6), 2-13.

Forehand, M. (2010). Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology, global text, Michael Orey, *https://granite.pressbooks.pub/*

Gehlbach, H., Brinkworth, M., & Harris, A. (2016). Changes in teacher-student relationships. British *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 690-704.

Hattie, J. (2015). *What works best in education: the politics of collaborative expertise*. Pearson.

Howe, C. & Abedin, M. (2013). Classroom dialogue: a systematic review across four decades of research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43, 325-356.

Hussain, M., Afzal, M., Akhtar, S., & Gilani, S.A. (2019). The impact of teacher-student interaction on student motivation and achievement. *European Academic Research*, 2(2), 1201 – 1222.

Kerem, C., & Cihan, K. (2020). *What happens during teacher–student interaction in the first year of primary school? A new explanation*. *https://journals.sagepub.com/*

Košir, K., & Tement, S. (2014). Teacher–student relationship and academic achievement: A cross-lagged longitudinal study on three different age groups. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 29(3), 409–428.

Li, L. & Yang, S. (2021). Exploring the influence of teacher-student interaction on university students' self-efficacy in the flipped classroom. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(2), 84 – 90. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v10n2p84

Maulana, R., Opdenakker, M., Stroet, K., & Bosker, R. (2017). Changes in teachers' involvement versus rejection and links with academic motivation during the first year of secondary education: A multilevel growth curve analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(9), 1348-71

Mercer, N, & Sams, C. (2006). Teaching children how to use language to solve mathematics problems. *Language Education*, 20, 507-528.

Pennings, H. J., Brekelmans, M., Sadler, P., Claessens, L. C., van der Want, A. C., & van Tartwijk, J. (2018). Interpersonal adaptation in teacher-student interaction*. Learning and Instruction*, 55(2), 41–57.

Stellenbosch University (2013). *Teaching, learning, assessment, curriculum and pedagogy*. *http://www.sun.ac.za/*.

Thorne, G. (2006). *10 strategies to enhance students' memory*. Center for development and learning. *http://www.cdl.org/.*

Zhang, Y. & Lin, C. H. (2019). Student interaction and the role of a teacher in a state virtual high school: what predicts online satisfaction. *Technology Pedagogy and Education*, *https://www.researchgate.net*