

African Research Review

International Multi-Disciplinary Journal,

Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

AFRREV Vol. 12 (2), Serial No 50, April, 2018: 87-100

ISSN 1994-9057 (Print) ISSN 2070-0083 (Online)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrev.v12i2.9>

Influence of Lecturers' Classroom Questioning Effectiveness on University Students' Achievement in Economics in South-West Nigeria

Olaniran, Nathaniel

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan

Phone: +2348035169752

E-mail: natholaniran2013@yahoo.com

Akorede, Serifat F.

Institute of Education, University of Ibadan

Phone: +2348131985396

E-mail: docserifat@yahoo.com

Abstract

Questions typically communicate a specific purpose related to identified content and context, and are usually intended to elicit an answer. In general, research shows that instruction involving questioning is more effective than instruction without questioning. The effective teaching and learning of economics require frequent use of questions to develop critical thinking skill in the learners which will graduate into the development of necessary skills to solve the societal problems. The study used ex-post facto design of survey research type; twenty (20) economics lecturers as well as two hundred (200) students were selected through multi-stage sampling techniques from the two sampled institutions. Two validated instruments were used to gather information in this study. These are: Students' Perception of Economics Lecturers' Questioning Effectiveness Scale ($r = .889$) and Economics Achievement Test ($r = .065$). Three research questions were raised and answered in this study. The data obtained were analyzed using Descriptive statistics (frequency count) and Pearson product moment correlation at 0.05 level of significance. Result revealed that lecturers are fond of using overhead, higher-order, probing, factual, lower-order, direct, display, follow-up, and rhetorical, questions sequentially, for facilitating teaching-learning processes. Result revealed a positive moderate significant relationship exist between lecturers' questioning effectiveness and University students' achievement in economics at ($r = 0.340, p < 0.05_{(0.000)}$). The paper recommended that: lecturers should be effective in the use of various questions at appropriate time; moreover, it is important for lecturers to always follow the procedure outline in this paper that will aid the effective classroom questioning practices. Also, there should be periodic seminars and workshops for lecturers on the use of questions in facilitating teaching and learning process.

Key Words: Questioning approaches, Classroom-interaction, Critical-thinking, Effective-teaching in Economics

Introduction

Teacher's questioning effectiveness is an area of interest in research milieu. Teacher's questioning technique play a central role in the processes of teaching and learning because students' learning, thinking, participation and their level of engagement depend on the kind of questions teachers formulate and use in the classroom. The high incidence of questioning as a teaching strategy and its consequent potential for influencing student learning have led many researchers to explore relationships between teachers' questioning methods and student achievement and acquisition of skills. Critical investigation into the literature reveals that teacher's questioning effectiveness has not receive much attention as it is sparsely mention among the authors and researchers of classroom interaction, in Nigeria.

Teacher's Questioning are useful for effective planning of classroom participation activities, for designing homework assignments, and for writing examinations (Good & Brophy, 2000). Effective questioning is a real compliment to the instructional skills. It shows the ability to understand the student's real needs. Effectiveness in questioning is a powerful, learned skill (Feldman, 2003; David, 2007; Dymoke & Harrison, 2008). Since, the days of Socrates, asking questions to assess students understanding has been a core component of teaching-learning process. Today, questioning is so prevalent in the classroom that it's difficult to picture a classroom in which a teacher isn't asking questions. In fact, literature revealed that verbal questioning is second only to lecturing as the most common instructional practice but the extent at which these questions are asked in the classroom, its influence on the students achievement have not being critically investigated (Black, 2001).

From the foregoing, it is obvious that one of the most common and prominent classroom activity is the act of teacher questioning and since, the teaching and learning processes always end in assessment, in order to accurately assess the students appropriately in teaching and learning of economics, the teachers must be effective in the way they structure and distribute their questions. Also, it helps teachers to capture accurately the skills the learners have acquired and the extent at which the behavioural objectives have been achieved in economics. Processes of reflection in classrooms are frequently initiated by questions. Questions typically communicate a specific purpose related to identified content and context, and are usually intended to elicit an answer. But additionally, a question also conveys a more general indirect request (Clarke, Xu, & Wan, 2013). This indirect request implies: Think about it! That is, reflection can be triggered through the use of questions. An individual's response to the attempted initiation of reflection depends on situational factors and individual conditions, such as prior experiences and knowledge. With the help of questions, teachers can invite students to follow and even participate in the teacher's externalized way of thinking and thereby model both reasoning and reflection (Walsh & Sattes, 2011).

Moreover, Skovsmose (2006) emphasized the importance of questions as facilitator and initiator of reflection. In classroom learning these questions could be raised by teachers, but also by students themselves. The assumption is that questions can be employed as the first observable indicators of the occurrence of reflection. The use and the effects of questions in learning have been investigated in many studies. Previous research has shown that most questions in classrooms are asked by teachers (Wragg & Brown, 2001). Teacher questions promoting reflection, together with the opportunity for students to learn through such questioning in classroom interaction, which may provide the means to realise not only contemporary educational aspirations, but also the aspirations of communities where student-initiated questions already occur, but are not promoted to best effect.

In general, research shows that instruction involving questioning is more effective than instruction without questioning (Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001). Questioning can be an enormously powerful weapon in the instructors arsenal, but can be equally as ineffective if not applied with diligence (Paul, 2016). Mason (2000) argues that style and nature of questions encountered by students strongly influence the sense that they make of the subject matter. Teachers constantly ask questions in class may be verbally or in written form. For instance, classroom exercises, assessments and assignment are in question form. It is an attempt by the teachers to investigate whether the students were listening and subsequently understand the lesson that was just taught (Mason, 2000).

Furthermore, Fakeye (2007) discovered in separate studies that majority of teachers' questions were on the lowest cognitive level, emphasizing facts, not higher level thinking. However in economics, lecturers need to ask high-order questions so as to enhance the development of critical thinking and analytical skills in the students. David (2007) conducted a study in Nigerian secondary schools to investigate the distribution of display and referential questions and to explore their effects on classroom interactions. The results of that study revealed that teachers used display questions more than referential ones and referential questions create less classroom interactions than the display ones. In addition, Boghossian (2012) asserted that teachers should realize that direct questioning might not be an appropriate technique for all students.

Teacher's Questions and questioning effectiveness influence learners' achievement, attitudes, and thinking skills. The level of the question tends to obtain a similar level of answer. Achievement can improve if high levels of questions are accompanied by wait-time, redirection, and probing techniques (Bowker, 2010). However, Ehindero and Ajibade (2000) found that dwindling teaching effectiveness among some University lecturers are responsible for the declining poor academic performance recorded among undergraduates. Effectiveness of any individual implies meeting up with the requirement it is meant to serve. For teacher to be effective in teaching means that they need to be fashioned to the target of their profession, that is they must suit the taste of the requirement of their profession. in other words, for teacher to be effective at teaching they must meet up with the intended result of the profession by delivering through appropriate methodology, utilizing appropriate teaching instructional aids, impacting positively on the students and meeting up with the objective of education scheme in the country (Dobbie, 2011).

Furthermore, Rick (2009) refers to an effective teacher as one who runs an effective classroom and touches the lives of children; he knows what to do and does it consistently. Furthermore, Adetayo (2011) described effectiveness in teaching as means or the ability to accomplish assigned duties of which teaching is the central part. Also, Cooper (2002) asserted that teaching effectiveness in economics lesson is sometime explained as the degree of increase in students' learning outcome or it can be the degree of teacher's competence in displaying appropriate pedagogical interaction. Avwiri (2011) asserted that teaching effectiveness is seen as the ability of the teacher to communicate the contents of his/her teaching in a way that learners will be able to comprehend the content and objectives of teaching. Barbara (2009) opined that teaching effectiveness is the collection of characteristics, competencies and behaviour of teachers at all educational levels that enable students to reach desired outcome which may include the attainment of specific learning objectives as well as broader goal such as being able to solve problems, think critically through teacher's questioning techniques, work collaboratively and become effective students.

Teacher's Questioning strategies are flexible and widely applicable. They may be tailored to fit the needs of different subjects, various types of information, and different levels of competence (Wilson & Smetana, 2011). Among the instructional skills that a teacher must possess to enhance students

acquisition of required skills questioning effectiveness is very paramount, questioning holds a place of prominence in many classrooms. When questions are used well:

- A high degree of student participation occurs as questions are widely distributed.
- An appropriate mix of low and high level cognitive questions is used.
- Student understanding is increased.
- Student thinking is stimulated, directed, and extended
- Feedback and appropriate reinforcement occur.
- Students' critical thinking abilities are honed.
- Student creativity is fostered (Anderson, Krathwohl & Airasian 2001).

Teacher's questions should be carefully planned, clearly stated, and focus on the point in order to achieve specific objectives. Teacher understanding of technique and effectiveness in questioning, wait time, and levels of questions is essential (Patricia, 2010). Teachers should also understand that asking and responding to questions is viewed differently by different student. The teacher must be sensitive to the ability level of the students and aware of the effects of his or her own questioning at increasing the interest of the learners in the classroom interaction (Paul & Elder, 2008). In addition, (Boghossian, 2012) asserted that teachers should realize that direct questioning might not be an appropriate technique for all students.

Posing of effective questions by the teacher encourage students to think on a higher level and respond in multiple ways (Kerry, 2002). Questions also monitor comprehension, help make connections to prior learning and stimulate cognitive growth (Vogler, 2005). Many questions also serve as diagnostic tools to help indicate students' academic progress and to assess students' critical thinking (Mason, 2000; Croom & Stair, 2005). Questions asked by the teacher in the course of teaching can contribute to the collective understanding of the class. The content of the questions and the manner in which teachers ask them determines whether or not they are effective. Some mistakes that teachers make during the question and answer process include asking vague questions (for example- What do you think of the story that we just read?). When questions such as the one mentioned is asked, students will usually not know how to respond and may answer the questions incorrectly. Thus, their feelings of failure may cause them to be more hesitant to participate in class, evoke some negative attitudes towards learning, and hinder the creation of a supportive classroom environment (Fakeye, 2007; Akandi, 2009; Ayede, 2012).

Good pedagogical skills or procedures require that the teacher spreads questions to all students such that all students have equal opportunity to participate in the lesson. If poor achieving students are not carried along, their learning weakness may get worse, especially if the teacher do not effectively recognize their learning difficulties and get them involved in the lesson. When questions are put into proper use that is, a teacher randomly distributing his or her questions to many students, it will not only help to keep the class interactive, but make individual students attentive. Closely related to good questioning skills or procedure in classroom interaction is that the teacher applies an amount of waiting time to allow the students to think through the questions and be able to provide the correct answer before the question is either redirected to another student or answered by the teacher (Okwilagwe, 2011)

Typology of Teacher's Classroom Evaluation Questions

Questioning as an instructional tool can be traced back to the fourth century, when Socrates used questions and answers to challenge assumptions, expose contradictions, and lead to new knowledge and wisdom. Questioning can be an undeniably powerful teaching approach. When teachers ask higher-order questions and give students opportunities to develop deep explanations, learning is

enhanced across content areas. The following types of questions are available for teachers to facilitate teaching and learning of economics:

High order or Analytical Questions: base on this type of question, Wimer, Ridenour, Thomas & Place (2001), Golkar (2003) demonstrated that high order questions are those questions that the teacher is not predisposed to expect a specific answer and promote analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of information. In addition, Croom and Stair (2005) asserted that the typical verbs that can be used at this level are identified, apply, choose, demonstrate, or illustrate. In other words they are the possible verbs found in the questions asked at the application level.

Low-Order or Recall Questions: Yip (2004) reiterated that low-order questions are used primarily in classrooms to assess the knowledge level of students. Golkar (2003) expressed that Low-order questions are those questions where the teacher attempts to predict the student's answers before asking the question and have pre-determined answers. Low-order questions are procedural or knowledge based questions that address information.

Follow-Up Questions: In this regard, Nystrand and Gamoran (1988) cited in Caram and Davis (2005) stated that follow-up questions are those in which a teacher incorporates a previous student answer into a subsequent question. These questions are often found to use pronouns and as guiding questions. These questions guide students to discuss problems and derive various concepts and procedures, or the questions of this type guide students to use certain concepts and procedures to solve problems (McHill & Dunkin, 2002).

Open-Ended Questions: Open-ended questions are questions without a fixed limit. An open-ended question is likely to receive a long answer. They encourage continued conversation, and help the teacher to get more information; they often provide opportunities to gain insight into the other person's feelings (Sahin & Kulm, 2006).

Closed-Ended Questions: Closed-ended questions have a fixed limit. A closed question can be answered with either a single word or a short phrase. They're often answered with a yes or no, or with a simple statement of fact. Closed-ended questions are used to direct the conversation (Good & Brophy, 2000).

Rhetorical Questions: The rhetorical question is usually defined as any question asked for a purpose other than to obtain the information base on the question asked (Cazden, 2001).

Overhead Questions: This type of question is not directed at any particular individual, but is asked of the entire class, asking overhead questions allows every students in the class to profit from the thinking involved in the formulation of an answer (Chin, 2006).

Direct Questions: A direct question is asked of one person whom you call by name before asking the question. Direct questions are especially effective when you suspect an individual's attention is wandering (Ornstein & Lasley, 2000).

Probing Questions: Series of questions which require students to go beyond the first response. Subsequent teacher questions are formed on the basis of the student's response (Chin, 2006; Tan, 2007).

Factual Questions: Questions which require the student to recall specific information he or she has previously learned. Often these use who, what, when, where (Groenke & Paulus, 2007).

Divergent Questions: Questions with no right or wrong answers, but which encourage exploration of possibilities, requires both concrete and abstract thinking to arrive at an appropriate response (Volger, 2005). Likewise, Harris (2000) asserted that divergent questioning arguably gives the students more

scope for critical thinking, problem solving and being creative in their answers. It also may help further stimulate questions and answers from students.

Affective Questions: Questions which elicit expressions of attitude, values, or feelings of the student (Hamm & Perry, 2002; Sahin&Kulm, 2006; Groenke& Paulus, 2007).

Display Questions are those questions for which the questioner knows the answer beforehand and such questions are usually asked for comprehension checks or clarification requests (Fakeye, 2007).

Referential Questions are questions which require information which the teacher does not know; they require the interpretation and judgment on the part of the person to whom the questions are directed. Referential questions will encourage students to air their views concerning the subject matter and set the students thinking thereby enhancing the development of their cognitive domain” (Fakeye, 2007).

The aforementioned types of questions can be classified into lower-order and higher-order questions. For instance, open-ended, probing and referential questions can be classified under higher-order questions and close-ended, rhetorical, overhead, direct, factual, divergent, affective and display questions can come under low-order questions. The authors such as Wood & Anderson (2001), Sahin & Kulm (2006), Groenke & Paulus (2007) Wilson & Smetana (2011) and Paul (2016) asserted that in practicing effective questioning in the classroom setting, the following steps should be followed:

1. Plan relevant questions: The essence of good questioning is in planning questions that are directly related to the concept or skill being taught.
2. Phrase questions clearly: Clear and concise phrased questions communicate what the teacher expected of the students’ responses.
3. Ask questions at all levels: Learning gains increase as the variety of types of questions increase. Vary the level of difficulty as to include questions on both concrete and abstract levels.
4. Ask higher-level questions to older students: Teachers should act as a facilitator of knowledge and ask deeper questions that will motivate their students engaging in higher-level thinking and communication.
5. Encourage wide student participation: Distribute questions to involve the majority of students. Balance responses from volunteering and non-volunteering students and encourage student-to-student interaction.
6. Allow adequate wait time: Give students time to think when responding. Allow three to five seconds of wait time after asking a question before requesting a student’s response, particularly when high-level questions are asked. The more time a teacher waits for a reply from the students the better the response and will encourage other students to participate.
7. Rephrase or redirect questions as needed: If a student is struggling to answer a question either redirect it to another or rephrase it so it is clearer.
8. Probe student responses in a non-judgmental way: Ask students more questions in order to elaborate and clarify on their answer, to support a point of view, or to extend their thinking to discover new information. Teachers should also assist with student’s incorrect responses.
9. Encourage students’ response: All questions should at least be acknowledged.
10. Provide praise and acknowledgement: Acknowledge and emphasize correct responses and reward good answers justly.

11. Do not repeat students' responses: Let students learn to listen for themselves.
12. Use both covert and overt strategies: Do not direct the question to anyone until it is asked. This forces all students to pay attention and requires more students to answer the question mentally. The initial use of covert strategies and following them with overt strategies produces active involvement and better individual responses. (Wood & Anderson, 2001, Sahin&Kulm, 2006, Groenke & Paulus, 2007, Wilson & Smetana, 2011 Paul, 2016).

The teaching and learning of Economics in University seems unsatisfactory as demonstrated by inability of the graduates to demonstrate the required skills in the world of work owing from the complaint from the employers of labour that nowadays graduate are not employable as asserted in the work of Ehindero & Ajibade (2000) that ineffective lecturing affect students' acquisition of basic skills. Stakeholders have blamed the problem on the way the teaching and learning of Economics are handled particularly when it comes to the issue of assessment and evaluation of students' learning. One major factor that has been identified as accounting for students' inability to demonstrate the required transferable skills in employment context highlighted in the literature is the teachers' questioning pattern. Researches revealed that majority of the lecturers are fond of using lower-order questions in teaching and learning of courses in University and economics that require higher-order questions that can develop in the learners, critical thinking skills and productive reflection habit is not exempted.

Although, several researches conducted have pointed to the positive influence of teachers' questioning pattern on students' academic achievement, most of these researches focused on other school subject such as English Language, Mathematics and Sciences majorly at secondary school level. The extent to which question types, and students' perception of the lecturers' questioning effectiveness correlate with achievement in Economics in University has not enjoyed much research attention. Besides, most of the previous studies in these areas are located outside Nigeria. For instance, Shomossi (2004) carried out a study in Tehran universities located in Iran, on teacher's questioning effectiveness in English language classrooms. The results indicated that display questions were used more frequently than referential ones and not all referential questions could create enough teacher-student interactions.

Furthermore, Ping and Butsakom (2012) investigated on Teacher's Questioning and Students' Critical Thinking in College English as Foreign Language Reading Classroom. The study was conducted in Kaili University (KU) in the southwest of China. The researcher found the teacher asked totally two hundred and eighty-nine content-related questions including both lower-cognitive and higher-cognitive levels. In terms of the frequency of each type of questions, the researcher discovered that, the number of lower-cognitive levels questions was much higher than the one of higher-cognitive levels questions. It is therefore imperative to carry out a further investigation on classroom questioning in Nigeria, particularly higher institution of learning, since majority of study on questioning in teaching-learning process in Nigeria were majorly in secondary schools. The study investigated teaching effectiveness: influence of questioning approaches on university students' achievement in economics in South-West Nigeria.

Research Questions

Based on the problem identified in this study, the following questions were raised and answered.

1. What type of questions (Higher-order, Lower-order, Open-ended and Rhetorical questions etc.) are commonly used among University economics lecturers in South-West Nigeria?
2. Is there any significant difference in the type of questions used by lecturers in the two sampled institutions in South-West Nigeria?

3. What is the relationship between lecturers' Questioning effectiveness and University Students' achievement in economics in South-West Nigeria?

Methodology

The Design: The study adopted an ex-post facto design of survey research type. This research type was chosen because the researcher does not have control over the variables as their manipulation had already occurred.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study comprised three hundred level university economics students in South-West Nigeria. Purposive sampling technique was used to select two federal Universities as shown in table 1. In each of the selected institutions, simple random sampling technique was adopted to select one hundred (100) students in year three who offer economics as their major subject combination. Likewise, purposive sampling technique was employed to choose twenty lecturers observed by the researchers.

Table 1: The Study Sample

S/N	States	Universities Sampled	No of Lecturers Sampled	No of Students Sampled
1.	Oyo	University of Ibadan, Ibadan.	10	100
2.	Osun	Obafemi Awolowo University, Ife.	10	100
Total		2	20	200

Instrumentation: Two validated instruments were used to collect data for the study. These are: Students' Perception of Economics Lecturers' Questioning Effectiveness Scale. This scale was constructed by the researchers; it consists of two sections, A and B. Section (A) focused on the demographic-data of the students. It consists of the students' gender, age. Section (B) consists of twenty-nine items on students perception of lecturers' questioning effectiveness (Type of question; Timing/Frequency of questioning in lecture processes; Lecturer's questioning Wait Time, placed along four options (Likert scale) ranging between (Most of the time = MT, Sometimes = S, Rarely = R, Never = N).the instrument was subjected to face and content validity. Cronbach Alpha was used to find the degree of internal consistency and a value of ($r = .889$) was obtained.

Economics Achievement Test (EAT): This instrument was adapted from series of past questions from the degree programme; it consisted of two sections, A and B: Section A was on the demographic-data of the students which consists of the students' gender, age. Section B consisted of 120 items adapted from five courses in economics curriculum, which are compulsory courses that cut across all economics students and must have been covered by 300 levels students of economics. The researcher prepared a table of specification (The test blueprint) that consisted of 120 items, each with four alternative options A, B, C, and D. The EAT items was categorized under three headings: knowledge, Comprehension and Thinking. EAT was rated as 1 mark per each correct item, 0 for wrong item and was trial tested on respondents who are similar to the participants of the study. The difficulty indices and discriminating indices of the items was found using Kuder Richardson formula ($KR - 20$). The items with difficulty indices between 0.40 and 0.75 and with discriminating indices between 0.32 and 0.45 were finally selected. This reduced the items to at least fifty (50) which the researchers finally used for the study and the resulting reliability co-efficient was 0.65.

Data Collection: Data was collected from the three hundred level students in the two sampled institution. This was done with the assistance of two (2) research assistants who were well trained and exposed to the importance of the study and the study was completed after four weeks.

Method of Data Analysis: Simple percentage count of descriptive statistics and Pearson Product Moment Correlation were used to analyse the data collected. Research questions one and two was analysed using descriptive statistics while research question three was analysed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

Result

Research Question One: What type of questions (Higher-order, Lower-order, Open-ended and Rhetorical questions etc.) are commonly used among University economics lecturers in South-West Nigeria?

Table 2: Participants Responses on Type of Questions Commonly Used among University Economics Lecturers

S/N	To what extent does your lecturers used these types of questioning methods in economics teaching-learning processes	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	X	SD
1.	Higher-Order or Analytical Question	95 (48%)	79 (40%)	24 (12%)	2 (1%)	3.34	.725
2.	Lower-Order or Recall Question	60 (30%)	104 (52%)	32 (16%)	4 (2%)	3.10	.730
3.	Follow-up Question	39 (20%)	94 (47%)	62 (31%)	5 (2.5%)	2.84	.762
4.	Rhetorical. Question	35 (18%)	57 (29%)	87 (44%)	21 (11%)	2.53	.902
5.	Overhead Question	126 (63%)	55 (28%)	15 (8%)	4 (2%)	3.52	.723
6.	Direct Question	57 (29%)	107 (54%)	25 (13%)	11 (6%)	3.05	.794
7.	Probing Question	79 (40%)	86 (43%)	25 (13%)	10 (5%)	3.17	.833
8.	Factual Question	66 (33%)	88 (44%)	40 (20%)	6 (3%)	3.07	.805
9.	Display Question	48 (24%)	87 (44%)	40 (20%)	25 (13%)	2.79	.949

The Result from table 2 revealed that 48% of the participants ticked most of the time 40% of the participants for sometimes, 12% of the participants for rarely, 1% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of Higher-order questions in teaching-learning process. Moreover, 30% of the participants ticked most of the time 52% of the participants for sometimes, 16% of the participants for rarely, 2% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of Lower-order questions in teaching-learning process.

Likewise, 20% of the participants ticked most of the time 47% of the participants for sometimes, 31% of the participants for rarely, 2.5% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of Follow-up questions in teaching-learning process. Also, 18% of the participants ticked most of the time 29% of

the participants for sometimes, 44% of the participants for rarely, 11% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of rhetorical questions in teaching-learning process.

In the same spirit, 63% of the participants ticked most of the time 28% of the participants for sometimes, 8% of the participants for rarely, 2% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of overhead questions in teaching-learning process. Similarly, 29% of the participants ticked most of the time 54% of the participants for sometimes, 13% of the participants for rarely, 6% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of direct questions in teaching-learning process.

Beside, 40% of the participants ticked most of the time 43% of the participants for sometimes, 13% of the participants for rarely, 5% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of probing questions in teaching-learning process. Again, 33% of the participants ticked most of the time 44% of the participants for sometimes, 20% of the participants for rarely, 3% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of factual questions in teaching-learning process.

Furthermore, 24% of the participants ticked most of the time 44% of the participants for sometimes, 20% of the participants for rarely, 13% of the participants for never on their lecturers' usage of display questions in teaching-learning process. Deducing from the responses of the respondents it was discovered that majority of the participants were of the opinion that their lecturers are fond of using higher-order, lower-order, follow-up, rhetorical, overhead, direct, probing, factual and display questions for facilitating teaching-learning processes. Since, most of the time and sometime take the larger percentage.

Research Question Two: *Is there any significant difference in the type of questions used by lecturers in the two sampled institutions in South-West Nigeria?*

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Difference in the Type of Questions Used by Lecturers in Sampled Institutions

S/N	UI	M	SD	OAU	M	SD
1.	Higher-Order or Analytical Question	3.49	.643	Higher-Order or Analytical Question	3.18	.770
2.	Lower-Order or Recall Question	3.10	.745	Lower-Order or Recall Question	3.10	.718
3.	Follow-up Question	2.78	.811	Follow-up Question	2.89	.709
4.	Rhetorical. Question	2.51	.904	Rhetorical. Question	2.55	.903
5.	Overhead Question	3.53	.771	Overhead Question	3.50	.674
6.	Direct Question	3.16	.788	Direct Question	2.94	.789
7.	Probing Question	3.47	.688	Probing Question	2.87	.861
8.	Factual Question	3.19	.861	Factual Question	2.95	.730
9.	Display Question	3.10	.798	Display Question	2.48	.990

Table 3 compared the frequency of the types of questions used among the observed economics lecturers in term of institution. It was observed that University of Ibadan economics lecturers were better off at using higher order, overhead, direct, probing, factual and display questions with their greater mean scores (Higher-order = 3.49, Overhead = 3.53, Direct = 3.16, Probing = 3.47, Factual =

3.19 and Display = 3.10) in all the aforementioned types of questions when compare with their counterparts from Obafemi Awolowo University who had the following mean scores (Higher-order = 3.18, Overhead = 3.50, Direct = 2.94, Probing = 2.87, Factual = 2.95 and Display = 2.48) respectively.

Likewise, it was discovered that lecturers from Obafemi Awolowo University were better-off at using follow-up and rhetorical questions with the following mean scores (Follow-up = 2.89, Rhetorical = 2.55) compared to their colleagues in University of Ibadan with these mean scores (Follow-up = 2.78, Rhetorical = 2.55) respectively. Surprisingly, the mean scores of the observed lecturers in the two institutions on Lower-order question ($X = 3.10$) were equal across the two sampled institutions.

Research Question Three: *What is the relationship between lecturers' Questioning effectiveness and University Students' achievement in economics in South-West Nigeria?*

Table 4: Correlation between Lecturers' Questioning Effectiveness and University Students' Achievement in Economics

Variables	No	X	SD	r	P	Remark
Lecturers' Questioning Effectiveness	200	3.45	.721	.340	< 0.05 (.000)	Sig
University Students' Achievement in Economics	200	3.43	.733			

Significant at 0.05

Table 4 presents the Pearson product moment correlation result of the relationships between lecturers' questioning effectiveness and University students' achievement in economics. The table reveals positive moderate significant relationship between the variables at ($r = 0.340$, $p < 0.05_{(.000)}$). This implies that lecturers' questioning effectiveness is one of the factors that determine University students' achievement in economics.

Discussion of Findings

The finding of this study which shows that lecturers are fond of using Higher-order, Lower-order, Follow-up, Rhetorical, Overhead, Direct, Probing, Factual and Display questions in facilitating teaching-learning processes buttresses the assertion of Bowker, (2010) who was of the opinion that teacher's questions and questioning effectiveness influence learners' achievement, attitudes, and thinking skills. The level of the question tends to obtain a similar level of answer. Achievement can improve if high levels of questions are accompanied by wait-time, redirection, and probing techniques. Likewise, the finding support David (2007) who conducted a study in Nigerian secondary schools to investigate the distribution of display and referential questions and to explore their effects on classroom interactions. The researcher results revealed that teachers used display questions more than referential ones and referential questions create less classroom interactions than the display ones.

Similarly the result of the significant relationship between lecturers' questioning effectiveness and University students' achievement in economics is in consonance with the assertion and findings of researchers and authors. For instance, Mason (2000) argues that style and nature of questions encountered by students strongly influence the sense that they make of the subject matter. Besides, the result is in line with Skovsmose (2006) who was of the opinion that the importance of questions as facilitator and initiator of reflection cannot be over emphasised in teaching and learning process. The author was of the view that in the classroom learning these questions could be raised by teachers or students themselves. However, Paul, (2016) was of the opinion that Questioning can be an

enormously powerful weapon in the instructors' arsenal, but can be equally as ineffective if not applied with diligence. This implies that teacher's questions should be carefully planned, clearly stated, and focuses on the point in order to achieve specific objectives.

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the findings of the research it was observed that lecturers are fond of using overhead, higher-order, probing, factual, lower-order, direct, display, follow-up, and rhetorical, questions sequentially, for facilitating teaching-learning processes in economics lectures which is a good practice since one-type question cannot operate in isolation. In other words, adaptation of different types of questions in classroom interaction will develop the critical thinking skill of the learners. Likewise, a positive moderate significant relationship exists between lecturers' questioning effectiveness and University students' achievement in economics. Therefore, lecturers should be effective in the use of various questions at appropriate time; moreover, it is important for lecturers to always follow the procedure outline in this paper that will aid the effective classroom questioning practices. There should be periodic seminars and workshops for lecturers on the use of questions in teaching and learning process.

References

- Adetayo, J.O. (2011). *An evaluation of the professional competence of the Nigerian certificate in education teachers of national teachers institute distance learning programme*. An Unpublished PhD Thesis submitted in the Institute of Education, University of Ibadan.
- Aiyede E. I. (2002). *Strategies for teaching English Language in large classes*. Unpublished P.G.D.E. project. University of Ibadan.
- Akandi, S.O. (2009). Relationship between Teachers' Questioning Style and Senior Secondary School Students achievement in English Language in Southern Ijaw Local Government Area, Bayelsa State. An Unpublished M.Ed project. University of Ibadan.
- Anderson, L.W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W. (2001). *Taxonomy of learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. 2nd ed., abridged. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn& Bacon.
- Avwiri, E. H. (2011). Approaches for Effective Teaching of Chemistry in Nigeria Secondary Schools. *Journal of Research in Education and Society* 2 (1) 236-240.
- Barbara, C. H. (2009). Teacher Effectiveness: A review of the international literature and relevance for improving education in Latin America. *Working Paper Series*.
- Black, S. (2001). Ask me a Question: How Teachers Inquiry in the Classroom. *American School Board Journal*, 188 (5), 43 – 45.
- Boghossian, P. (2012). Socratic pedagogy: Perplexity, humiliation, shame and a broken egg. *Educ Philos Theory*.44 (7):710–720.
- Bowker, M. H. (2010). Teaching students to ask questions instead of answering them. *Thought & Action*.26 (Fall):127–134.
- Caram, C. A. & Davis, P. B. (2005). Inviting Student Engagement with Questioning. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 42 (1), 18-23.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Chin, C. (2006). Classroom interaction in science: Teacher questioning and feedback to students' responses. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28 (11), 1315–1346.
- Clarke, D. J., Xu, L., & Wan, M. E. V. (2013). Students speaking mathematics: Practices and consequences for math-ematics classrooms in different countries. In B. Kaur, G. Anthony, M. Ohtani, & D. J. Clarke (Eds.), *Student Voice in Mathematics Classrooms around the World* (pp. 33–52). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Croom, B., & Stair, K. (2005). Getting from q to a: Effective questioning for effective learning. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 78, 12-14.
- David, O. F. (2007). Teacher questioning Behavior and ESL classroom interaction. *Humanity and Social Sciences Journal*, 2, 127-131.
- Dobbie, W. (2011). Teacher characteristics and students' achievement: Evidence from teach for balance. Retrieved 4th June 2013.
- Dymoke, S., & Harrison, J. (2008). *Reflective teaching and learning: A guide to professional issues for beginning secondary teachers*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ehinderero, O. J., Ajibade, Y. A. (2000). What our students say about how we teach. *Ife Journal of Educ. Studies* 7(1), 1-9.
- Fakeye, D. O. (2007). Teachers' questioning behavior and ESL classroom interaction pattern. *Humanity and Social Services Journal* 2(2): 127-131.
- Feldman, S. (2003). The right line of questioning. *Teaching Pre k-8*; 33 (4), 8.
- Golkar, M. (2003). Classroom observation: interaction time and question and answer patterns. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 79-89.
- Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. (2000). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Longman.
- Groenke, S. L. & Paulus, T. (2007). The role of teacher questioning in promoting dialogic literary inquiry in computer-mediated communication. *JRTE (Journal of Research on Technology in Education)*, 40 (2), 141–164.
- Hamm, J.V., & Perry, M. (2002). Learning general science in first-grade classroom: o whole authority? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 126-137.
- Harris, R. L. (2000). Batting 1,000: Questioning techniques in student-centred classrooms. *The Clearing House*, 74 (1), 25-26.
- Kerry, T. (2002). *Explaining and questioning*. Cheltenham, UK: Nelson Thornes.
- Marzano, R., Pickering, D. & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mason, J. (2000). Asking mathematical questions mathematically. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 31(1), 97-111.
- Okwilagwe, E. A. (2011). *Teaching and learning secondary school Geography in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Lasley, T. J. (2000). *Strategies for effective teaching*. (3rd ed.). Boston, USA: McGrawHill Higher Education.

- Patricia, A. (2010). Classroom questioning: Teachers' perceptions and practices. Research centre for didactics and technology in teacher education. University of Aveiro. Portugal. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*.
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2008). Critical thinking: The art of socratic questioning, part III. *J Dev Educ.* 31(3):34–35.
- Paul, M. (2016). Four questioning strategies for effective and thoughtful teaching. *Journal of Teach thought*.
- Rick, (2009). *Qualities of a good teacher*. <http://www.drlick.org.com/pos/509/08/14>
- Sahin, A., & Kulm, G. (2006). *Sixth grade general science teacher's use of probing and guiding questions*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Skovsmose, O. (2006). *Reflection as a challenge*. *ZDM*, 38(4), 323–332.
- Tan, Z. (2007). Questions in Chinese university EL classrooms: What lies beyond it? *RELC*, 38 (1), 87-103.
- Vogler, K. (2005). Improving your verbal questioning. *Clearing House*, 79, 98-103.
- Walsh, J. A., & Sattes, B. D. (2011). *Thinking through quality questioning. deepening student engagement*. London, UK: Sage.
- Wilson, N. S., Smetana, L. (2011). Questioning as thinking: A metacognitive framework to improve comprehension of expository text. *Literacy*. 45(2):84–90.
- Wimer, J. W., Ridenour, C. S., Thomas, K., & Place, A.W. (2001). High order of teacher questioning of boys and girls in elementary General science classrooms. *Journal of Education Research*, 95, 84-93.
- Wood, A. T., & Anderson, C. H. (2001). *The case study method: Critical thinking enhanced by effective teacher questioning skills*. Lund, Sweden: Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the World Association for Case Method Research & Application.
- Wragg, E. C. & Brown, G. (2001). *Questioning in the secondary school*. London, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Yip, D.Y. (2004). Questioning skills for conceptual change in science instruction. *Journal of Biological Education*, 38, 76-83.