

## **The Affective Domain of Assessment in Colleges and Universities: Issues and Implications**

**Michael Olalekan Olatunji**

Institute for Educational Leadership, Botswana

### **Abstract**

A comprehensive Assessment is indispensable for effective guidance, appropriate placement of students and relevant educational development. This paper attempts an examination of issues concerning the affective domain of assessment as an integral part of general assessment and draws out the implications of these issues. The paper also discusses the significance and the need for consistent affective assessment and the modality of using the data obtained through affective assessment to provide holistic educational experience to students. Among other things, it is suggested that students and educators be made to realize the value of affective attributes. To do this successfully, these attributes are to be clearly and specifically developed, taught and assessed in their own rights as opposed to their being simply integrated in cognitive tasks.

**Keywords:** Assessment, cognitive, affective, administrators, educators, learners

**Correspondence:** [mikeolatunji47@gmail.com](mailto:mikeolatunji47@gmail.com)

## Introduction

Education is the strategic development of human capital and it contributes in no small measure to development at national and international levels. Education however is useful only when the objectives and content of the enterprise are tailored towards the needs of the people to be served. Furthermore, in order to guarantee the usefulness of education, it has to be comprehensive in nature and it must have integrated into it, a holistic assessment measure.(Idowu&Esere 2009). One of the cardinal responsibilities of a school is the certification of individual students registered therein. This certification responsibility makes assessment indispensable. Ogunleye (2002)describes assessment as a means whereby the teacher obtains information about knowledge gains, behavioral changes and other aspects of the development of learners.It was at the 1948 conference of the American Psychological Association that a call was made to develop educational taxonomies or classification schemes of the learning domains (Bloom, Engelhart,Furst, Hill, &Krathwohl, 1956). These classification systems were intended to function as communication tools and standardized structures by which educators could better establish curricula and initiate research on learning (Menix, 1996). The first and most influential of these taxonomies covered the cognitive domain and was introduced in 1956. Over the intervening years, Bloom's Taxonomy for the cognitive domain (Bloom et al 1956) has been the subject of much research. To this day, it continues to exert significant influence on curricular development and assessment practices worldwide.

Additional taxonomies were developed in the psychomotor and affective domains of learning in subsequent years but their international acceptance and usage have been relatively low. Comparatively few professors are aware of or focus upon the affective domain of learning taxonomy (Krathwohl, Bloom, &Masia, 1964). Similarly, Oakland (1997) observed that during its 110-year history, Academic and Research Psychologists have devoted a lot of attention to cognitive qualities. Emphasis on empirical research which explores and defines theories and concepts of intelligence, achievement, and cognitive aspects of neuropsychology generally have out-weighted similar activities focusing on affective qualities. In the same vein, Saxon and Calderwood (2008) observe that practically all assessment done in the United States colleges and universities is cognitive. Popham (2011) also observes that for centuries, educators have known about the three domains of learner behavior; the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. Citing Unites State of America as an example, Popham highlights the fact that as part of a heavy emphasis on accountability and reform, attention has been on the cognitive domain almost exclusively. According to him, most classroom teachers do not devote their attention directly to their students' affective constructs, and even greater number of teachers fails to assess them. Bad as the situation is in the United States concerning the usage of the affective taxonomy of learning, the situation does not fair better in developing countries as one would expect. For example, a study conducted by Idowu and Esere on assessment in Nigerian Schools in 2009 shows among other things that 95% of the respondents do not factor affective and psychomotor measure into the overall performance of their students while 10% of the respondents claimed ignorance and incompetence in the use of non-test devices.

Despite the fact that educational evaluators ( Iyewarun, 1986; Okon, 1986; Miller, Frank, Franks & Getto, 1989; Obe, 1986 ) have prescribed a departure from this trend of neglecting affective assessment to make room for a comprehensive picture of the development of learners in the school system, no significant change has taken place even in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This is attested to by many authors who continue to deplore the tendency for affective outcomes to carry little or no weight in summative assessment(see for example Howe, 2003, Maas Weigert, 2006, and Popham 2011) As a step towards ensuring that the benefits of affective taxonomy of learning and affective assessment do not continue to elude learners and also that the system of incomplete educational experience does not continue

unabated, attempt is made in this paper to discuss the implications of continued downplay of the affective taxonomy of learning and affective assessment. One opines that this will further sensitize all and sundry to the havoc that is being done by the continued aversion to affective domain of assessment and the need to put in place a very urgent remedy. In setting the background therefore, attempt is also made to clarify the purpose of affective education and its origin, highlight the taxonomy of affective qualities, examine the issues inherent in affective domain of learning taxonomy and affective Assessment. With these in the background, effort is made in discussing the modalities of making the best use of affective taxonomy of learning and affective assessment.

### **Concept Clarification**

Birbeck and Andre (2009) rightly point out that the affective domain is a vague concept that could relate to at least three different aspects of teaching and learning. According to them, the affective domain firstly could be about the teacher's approach to teaching in terms of philosophy and what this communicates to the student. In this case, the affective domain relates to the way in which the teacher interacts with students to establish a relationship. Secondly, the affective domain could be about stirring up the affective attributes of students as a deliberate form of engagement. The essence of such a method could be to show disapproval or annoyance at an act of injustice and by so doing, some students may be encouraged to take a greater level of participation. With the first and second perspective of affective domain, the onus is on the teacher to establish the learning environment. It is expected that students will respond positively or otherwise. However, they do not initiate. Thirdly, the affective domain could be about learners being engaged with the development and understanding of their own motivations, attitudes, values and feelings with respect to behavior as a citizen and a professional. The discussion in this paper is based on the third perspective.

### **The Source of Affective Learning**

Affective learning characterizes the emotional area of learning reflected by beliefs, values, interests, and behaviors of learners (Krathwohl et al, 1964; Smith & Ragan, 1999; Gronlund & Brookhart, 2009). Affective learning is concerned with how learners feel while they are learning, as well as with how learning experiences are internalized so they can guide the learner's attitudes, opinions, and behavior in the future (Miller 2005).

There are two main schools of thought concerning affective education. The first school of thought maintains that the content of affect (values, morals and ethics) is found in sources external to human experience. This idea has its source in the philosophy of Realism and Idealism as well as in Religion. According to this school of thought, beliefs; values are to be found in divine inspiration and the wisdom of the elders over the years. For example individuals of the Christian persuasion accepts God's commandment by faith, reason being that the source is seen as supernatural and that God is sovereign. Other injunctions that have been in operation for years are also accepted based on culture as lay down by the elders. In the field of education therefore, when beliefs are identified, it is expected that these beliefs be inculcated in the learners and the learners' be made to comply. This is an absolutist affective education and it works through indoctrination. The second school of thought maintains that the content of affect should be derived mainly from the analysis of human experience. This view has its source in the philosophy of Pragmatism enunciated by Dewey (1939). According to this school of thought, values are developed as the individual or group goes through a process in stages. These stages as put forward by Dewey for the individual or group are:

1. Interact with the environment
2. Reflective thinking on the meaning of the interaction

3. Based on the reflective thought, formulate values or beliefs
4. Based on reflective thinking, apply the formulated values to new situations

As reflective thinking continues concerning the new situation, the original values or beliefs will either be reconfirmed or changed. This school of thought does not envision a society of entirely autonomous values (Raths, 1975) but emphasis the capacity of human beings to engage in meaningful reflective thinking. Within the context of the school system this view leads to developmental affective education. What the school does therefore when operating on the basis of this view is to guide learners to come up with values or beliefs through reflective thinking and also encourage learners to embrace values that are fundamental such as the right to human dignity. This conception of affective education has a lot in common with telonomic position put forward by Phenix (1969) with his emphasis being on the need for schools to promote a lifelong enquiry for values through critical thinking. Similarly, Raths values education (1978) and Kohlberg's moral education (1978) can be traced to this conception of affective education.

Apart from the absolutist and the Pragmatic views, another conception that one cannot ignore in any discussion of affective education has to do with the psychological theories of Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, Earl Kelley and Arthur Combs (1962). These emphasize the cardinal role of personality and perception in learning. They recommend that priority attention be given to self concept, interpersonal relations and the discovery of personal meaning in the curriculum. Within the school system, this view is generally known as humanistic education. The work of Raths (1972) on emotional needs and that of Combs (1972) on value development reveals a similarity between developmental education and humanistic education. A major difference however is that Dewey and the members of his school of thought place emphasis on social development whereas the humanistic psychologist place emphasis on personal growth. Developmental affective education therefore is based on the works of John Dewey and that of the humanistic psychologist.

### **Taxonomy of Affective Qualities**

Krathwohl et al (1964) proposed a five level taxonomy of the affective domains arranged in a hierarchy according to complexity.

The first level of the affective taxonomy is referred to as "receiving". At this level, the learner is aware of the topic, stimuli, event or issue and is willing and ready to learn about it or respond to it. It follows therefore that in order to progress in the taxonomy; a learner must be aware of and attend to the issue or event in question. Where the learner fails to receive information, progress on affective hierarchy becomes stocked. A common example of this level of affective learning is class attendance and concentration during lectures at school. During the process of "receiving" the learner comes across new ideas and makes effort to understand them.

The Second level, "responding" ranges from compliance by voluntary response to having a sense of satisfaction in doing what is required. For example, a learner obeys class rules and regulations, complies with teacher's instructions and participates in class activities as required.

The third level is referred to as "Valuing". At this level the learner voluntarily manifests behaviors that are consistent with certain beliefs. For example, when a learner demonstrates kind gestures towards others, comes punctually to school, does and submits assignment as and when due. Students demonstrate "valuing" when they consistently prioritize time effectively to meet academic obligations and when they, for example, practice

the safe handling of equipment and materials in a laboratory science course throughout a semester (Gronlund & Brookhart, 2009).

At the fourth level of the taxonomy; “Organization” the learner organizes a set of values into a value system (i.e. the learners general set of values) that are used to respond to diverse situations. Gronlund (1991) confirms the increasing complexity of this form of learning in his observation that: “as affective outcomes move from simple to complex, they become increasingly internalized and integrated with behaviors..... to form complex value systems and behavior patterns” (p.55)

The fifth level and which is the highest level in the hierarchy of affective taxonomy is “characterization by a value or value set” and this occurs when a student’s behavior is consistent and predictable as if it has been adopted as a life style (Gronlund, 1991, p. 34). In other words, the student has internalized the values to the extent that they characterize him or her.

### **Affective Learning & Assessment: The Issues and Their Implications.**

Though in existence for long, affective learning taxonomy has neither been recognized nor used in curriculum development to the same degree as the cognitive taxonomy. There are numerous factors that contribute to higher education’s collective aversion to the affective domain (Pierre & Oughton, 2007). A school of thought opines that affective learning is a byproduct of cognitive learning and for this reason it is argued that affective learning outcomes do not need to be indicated, taught, or assessed separately. Furthermore it is maintained that there are in fact, close parallels between Bloom’s taxonomy for the cognitive domain and Krathwohl’s taxonomy for the affective domain (Smith & Regan, 1999) and because of this, special attention should not be give to the affective domain. Further challenges in affective learning and assessment is said to arise from difficulties in precisely stating desired affective learning outcomes because they involve opinions, beliefs, and attitudes (Bloom et al 1956; Smith and Regan, 1999).

Yet another school of thought that seeks to explain the lack of attention given to the affective domain maintains that the cognitive domain is intuitive in that it seems to make sense at the University to concentrate on the body of knowledge, makes sense for students to develop problem solving skills and to critically question science and society and makes sense to have graduates who have the capacity to develop creative response to difficult and complex problems (Krathwohl et al, 1964; Pierre & Oughton, 2007). It is also argued that the cognitive domain is relatively easy to assess and to apply sound assessment practices like moderation to ensure some level of objectivity and fairness (Pierre & Oughton, 2007). On the other hand the affective domain is said to be contentious raising all manner of fundamental challenges and questions that go to the very heart of the purpose of education at a tertiary level and asks hard questions about social and cultural power in education, such as:

- How does one judge intrinsic qualities such as values, motivation, feelings and attitudes?
- Is higher education an appropriate place to develop qualities such as hard work or having a goal?
- If so how should they be assessed?
- What will be used as a standard upon which one judges?
- How does one ensure any sense of validity and transparency?

- How can one tell if students are authentically displaying these intrinsic traits and not just “playing the game”? (Birbeck.&Andre 2009)

Again, and in a sense most pervasively, affective learning in schools has suffered from neglect, wherein faculty have failed to identify and describe their legitimate aims for students’ affective learning (Colby & Sullivan, 2009; Pierre & Oughton, 2007; Shephard, 2008). Shephard further submits that some individuals avoid specifying student affective learning outcomes because they are afraid of being accused of indoctrination or brainwashing.

Plausible as these arguments may be or seem to be, one opines that they do not justify the apathy concerning affective domain of assessment and affective education in schools. According to Stiggins (2005, p.199 – 200), “motivation and desire represents the very foundation of learning. If students do not want to learn, there will be no learning. Desire and motivation are not academic achievement characteristics, they are affective characteristics”. This being the case, the only avenue of working on learners’ desire and motivation has long remained unattended to. Nolting (2007) points out that performance in mathematics has almost as much to do with students’ attitudes and beliefs as it has to do with their mathematical knowledge. Mathematics and the sciences have for many years been seen as dreaded areas by many students and the situation is still the same. More often than not, the blame is on the “innocent” students while not many are ready to admit the fact that the curriculum is lopsided and the students’ negative attitude could also be due to this. The lack of necessary attention being given to “desire and motivation” in schools through the promotion and assessment of affective characteristics has cause a lot of problems especially in the field of science and mathematics. With the increasing import of technology in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the need to give affective characteristics and their assessment the rightful place can no longer be over emphasized.

At all levels of the school system there is the possibility for the level of interest in learning and the desire to excel academically to diminish over time. While this is a common occurrence, a good number of learners do drop out of school for inability to see the relevance in the school curriculum. Among those who succeeded in pulling through school programs some do end up totally disengaged from the educational process for the same reason. This is also an attendant effect of the absence of regular teaching and assessing of affective characteristics embedded in the curriculum. Such teaching and assessment if put in place would enable educators to keep regular watch on students’ beliefs concerning their ability to meet educational objectives and standards as well as the students’ attitudes concerning the relevance and importance of the content they are learning. Affective construct therefore puts the educator in a good position to identify on time students with the likelihood of dropping out of the system. Since not much use is being made of the affective construct, a lot of casualties continued to be recorded by way of learners dropping out of school or losing interest after completing a segment of the educational system successfully.

Popham, (2011, p.233) argues that the reason such affective variables such as students’ attitudes, interest and values are important is because they typically influence future behavior. He highlights further that it is necessary to promote positive attitudes towards learning because students who have positive attitudes towards learning today will be inclined to pursue learning in the future. It follows therefore that where the machinery through which the affective status of learners can be assessed are not put in place it becomes practically impossible to know how students are predisposed to behave in subsequent years. This is the prevailing scenario within the school system and the implication is that those who would have been helped while still within the system lost the opportunity because there was no way of knowing their affective status which would have paved the way for such students to benefit from affective education.

Ideally, education is to prepare the learner for citizenship and citizenship precludes an individual who is not just able to read, write, carry out mathematical operations, think critically, be an effective employee or employer but also possess a general sense of social responsibility. However, for many years now, looking at those graduating from school, a learner with pass marks in his or her subjects (courses/program of study) receives a certificate at the end of the course no matter how “unruly” he or she may be without any indication of the affective status. This is all because the affective traits do not have any place in students’ certification. Apart from the certificate that shows academic attainment institutions do not keep nor issue any document that shows affective characteristics of students’ and such document with institutional authentication is not required in the job market either. To some extent, the “moral problems” in the society can be traced to this. Relatively, learning is on the increase, more people are having access to education and the whole process is getting increasingly modernized by the day but paradoxically, morality is also fast disappearing and the society is increasingly becoming unsafe. Little wonder that cases of leaders of nations who are looting state treasuries and absconding are on the increase. Sit down tight leaders of nations are also multiplying. These are some of the cumulative effects of educational system that is devoid of attention to affective education and assessment. Reasons being that it is fraught with difficulties, therefore the exclusive focus on the cognitive domain.

It is not uncommon in some societies for learners to go to school with pistols and colleagues and educators have been known to be victims of gun violence even at school. Similarly in some societies, suicide, rape, bullying, drugs and all kinds of atrocities are common features in many schools. For example, while commenting on the situation in the United States of America, Nooman & Vavra (2007) submit that crime in schools and colleges is one of the most troublesome social problems in the nation. Dicken (2007) also highlights the fact that the shootings at the University of Memphis and Delaware State, along with the arrests of gunmen on the campuses of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and at St John’s University have reinforced the belief among all constituents involved in campus safety that more needs to be done to ensure the safety of all who live and work in these environments. In addition, Ghoneem(2012) submits that violence is a social phenomenon that cannot be accepted anywhere especially in Islamic societies; such as the Jordanian society. He however laments that violence has become a widespread phenomenon at universities. According to him, the concern about violence in universities escalated when in April 2010, a student at the Al Balqa Applied University was murdered by a fellow student at the university gate. In the same vein, Rotimi (2005) reports that cultism has become a major social problem both within and outside the Nigerian universities. He explains further that the emergence of secret cultism has been characterized by some bizarre and violent activities which include, physical torture as a means of initiating new members, maiming and killing of rival cult members and elimination of real and perceived enemies. With incessant secret cult activities, Rotimi submits that the centers of learning in Nigeria have become centers of violence. Furthermore, a study carried out by Atwoli et al (2011) among students in colleges and university campuses within Eldoret Municipality in Western Kenya shows that the prevalence of substance is high and causes significant physical and psychosocial problems in this population. Benneth et al (2007) also confirm the fact that since early 1990’s there have been a number of important studies on the nature and practice of sexual harassment and sexual violence in higher education institutions in South Africa and neighboring countries. According to them, the picture painted by the researchers is one in which many forms of sexual abusive interactions could be found simultaneously within higher education institutions. A memory study by Chege (2006b) in which diary entries show Kenyan female university students documenting memories of sexual violation that left them feeling vulnerable, exposed and helpless attests to the level of sexual violence in Kenyan universities.

One of the diary entries reads:

*Dear Diary... I was a first year in my second semester in Campus. I was going to pick my notes from a course-mate I had given during class time. It was around 7.30pm and I had gone to the boys' hostel. This was not late since people are allowed to go 6 visiting up to 10.00pm. I was going to the 3rd floor. Up the stairs it seemed a bit dark since some bulbs were not working. On approaching the 3rd floor, a jamaa (a guy) started going down the floor but he seemed to come right straight to me. I thought he was drunk; maybe he had missed his way. I paved way for him but, as I was doing that he got hold of my breasts and squeezed them, then planted his lips on my lips. I couldn't scream since his mouth was on mine. Finally he let me go and said he wished he had gone all the way... He said I wish "ningekumanga" that is he wished he had sex with me. I stood there confused whether to proceed or go back; since I was now afraid of my friend also. I run back down stairs and went to my room. I felt so stupid and fooled since I could not defend myself. I have met this guy even after this incidence and he always comes close to me and reminds me of that day on the stairs. This incidence made me defer from going to visit friends in boys' hostel (memories in student's diary - pseudonym Carol).*

Moreover, Krebs et al (2007) submit that sexual assault is clearly an issue in need of attention by the campus community in the United States of America given its high prevalence and adverse consequences. According to them one out of five undergraduate women experience an attempted or completed sexual assault since entering college. They point out that the majority of sexual assault occurs when women are incapacitated due to their use of substance, primarily alcohol. For many students in the United States of America, college offers an environment notorious for encouraging excessive drinking and experimenting with drugs (Krebs et al 2007).

Research data indicates that relationships in the classroom have direct effect on learning (Russel 2004) and if learners are to master skills, learning must take place. However if assessment and education in the affective domain through which the factors of relationships can be addressed is ignored, the cognitive area will be negatively affected. More specifically, violence against students may result in higher levels of absenteeism (Rigby & Slee, 1993), greater truancy (Green, 2006) and increased likelihood of drop out (Leach and Mitchell, 2006) which are described by Lewin (2007) as forms of silent exclusion from school, all of which contribute to less effective learning. Levels of absenteeism have also been shown to increase with the severity of victimization which in turn has been related to depression, anxiety, sadness, loneliness and general low self esteem (Rigby 2003).

The aforementioned research reports suggest that the three domains of cognitive, psychomotor and affective are tightly integrated aspects of human learning. Furthermore, the reports show how the educational experience of many have been and are being grossly hindered.

Griffith & Nguyen (2006) rightly liken the cognitive domain when focused upon alone in the curriculum at the expense of the affective domain to a skeleton without the skin. Strangely enough that is what the curriculum in colleges and universities have continued to be for years (Popham 2011). It is frightening to imagine the impact that such incomprehensive curriculum will have on the society in the distant future going by the negative consequences witnessed so far.

Olubor & Ogonor (2007) carried out a study that hinges on production theory. The crux of the theory is that in the school, if the change agents adequately process the inputs into the system, the desired output can be attained. In the school set up, the educators and pupils are both the inputs while the educators are also the main agents in the processing stage. The ability of the educators to successfully carry out the processing stage diligently, determines the expected output which in the study is the good citizen. They however submit

that citizenship education can best be taught in schools by using teaching methods in the affective domain. They correctly observe that this is the right approach to the acquisition of learning which has to do with values, beliefs, attitudes, social relations, emotional adjustments, habits and life styles. While a need and the pride of every nation is good citizens in increasing number, paradoxically the only viable means of attaining this; the teaching and assessing of affective characteristics is not receiving the necessary attention in schools. This explains why the cry for good citizenship in many nations is not bringing in the expected result and the bulk of the students that schools are turning out to lack desirable social attitudes.

Even with the focus on the cognitive domain, our schools are still producing many students that fall short in this area. The biggest critics of today's educational system are the business community and those who have graduated from school. Though they too passed through the system, they can now see that it is not actually giving those passing through it what it takes to actually perform excellently out there in the wider world. As Griffith & Nguyen (2006) point out, what good is the acquisition of a vast range of academic skills if we are unable to integrate them? They observe that students need to be able to communicate value, organize and characterize, to effectively utilize and make sense of what they have learnt. These however are affective characteristics. This being the case, it is extremely difficult, if not totally impossible to attain maximally in the cognitive domain unless the complementary skills in the affective domain are not only taught well but carefully developed and consistently assessed.

Sumsion & Goodfellow (2004) in their work mapping generic skills across a number of curriculums articulate their concerns with what they describe as "unproblematised accounts of the development of generic skills and qualities" (p330). They claim that the skills that one might develop in an environment such as in a higher education setting might not automatically transfer to other settings. Furthermore, they assert there is a difference between capacity and competence such that "—capacity extends beyond competence; it involves an ability and a willingness to apply understanding, knowledge and skills to unfamiliar contexts and unfamiliar problems (p.332). Precisely, the argument is that while cognitive skills may be developed well enough at university, unless the student has certain affective capabilities they are less likely to be able to use their cognitive skills and understanding across a range of environments. (Boud & Falchikov, 2006). Consequently, there must be an explicit relationship between cognitive learning, assessment and "capability" (Sumsion & Goodfellow, 2004). Crebert, Bates, Bell, Patrick and Cragolini (2004) claim that a student's ability to integrate and demonstrate generic skills across contexts "Requires ethics, judgment and self confidence to take risks and a commitment to learn from experience" (p.148). "*The idea of skills, even generic skills is a cull de sac. In contrast, the way forward lies in construing and enacting pedagogy for human being. In other words, learning for an unknown future has to be understood neither in terms of knowledge or skills but of human qualities and dispositions*". (Barnett, 2004, p.247). In 'Learning for an unknown future' Barnett (2004) states that a being capable of thriving with uncertainty needs dispositions; "Among such dispositions are carefulness, thoughtfulness, humility, criticality, receptiveness, resilience, courage and stillness" (p.258). The reality of the submissions of Crebert et al & Barnet can be seen in the common cases of graduates from school with certificates showing brilliant academic attainments but who cannot deliver in the society. Therefore we have many countries with engineers in various field of specialization yet the basic things like power, water, good roads cannot be guaranteed. This is not because funds were not provided but simply because "the professionals" just could not function on the field. Similarly, there are many countries with specialists in the various aspects of administration, yet nothing is working. Affective assessment data has the advantage of improving academic performance through its positive effect on instructional strategies; what to teach, the methodology to adopt in teaching it, when to teach, the objective of teaching, the audience and where the teaching is to take place. All these are critical and sensitive decisions.

The cognitive and the affective domains are interdependent. For this reason, focusing on cognitive constructs to the exclusion of affective construct can only unavoidably lead to an incomplete educational experience for the learners and this is the situation in colleges and universities. The resultant effect of this among other things is that we have students for example with an advanced knowledge of teaching and with great abilities but with little or no regard for teaching profession or the ethical standards that govern it and carrying along with them the notion that they are the awful lot. Similarly, in various professions, many have thrown ethical standard to the dogs. Educators can only foster the desired positive change in learners' dispositions, attitudes, values and ethical perspectives by obtaining necessary information through a diligent and consistent assessment of affective characteristics. Incidentally the affective domain has been left dormant for some time now. The essence of assessing dispositions is to ensure that the learners have positive productive attitudes, values, etc so that the educators can capitalize on these, work on them to bring about increased attainment on the part of the learners. Where the assessment reveals negative feelings, the onus is on the educators to labor for necessary educational experiences that will bring about the anticipated positive dispositions.

Krathwol, Bloom & Masia (1964, p.60) in their seminal work describe the affective domain by contrasting it with the cognitive domain thus: "In the cognitive domain we are concerned that the student shall be able to do the task when requested. In the affective domain we are more concerned that he does do it when it is appropriate after he has learned he can do it" Krathwohl's definition is shows that the emphasis in the affective domain is : "did you" or didn't you" when you knew how? . With this definition the problem of subjectivity is totally ruled out. Birbeck (2008) gives a practical application of Krathwohl's distinction when he writes:

*I once taught ethics to fourth year education students. The final assessment asked the students to discuss their understanding of ethics and they were encouraged to use examples from their experiences on preceding practicum placements. One student wrote about how he came to believe that a student in his year two class had been sexually abused. He reported the matter to his mentor teacher and his ethical discussion in his essay centered on the fact that to his knowledge the teacher did not comply with South Australian law in terms of mandatory notification. What was not covered in the essay was that the student had completed his mandatory notification training and was under an equally compelling obligation as his mentor teacher to notify. Arguably, he had a higher obligation as it was his conviction of the abuse that raised the issue. ---He could have reported but he did not----he has not demonstrated that he has the capacity to protect his students; an expectation placed on his profession by society, his employer and by his profession.*

Applying Krathowl's et al (1964) description enables one to judge an outcome in the affective domain without necessarily occupying the untenable position of judging another's attitude, values, feelings or motivations. The judgment is carried out by aligning the student's actions with what is expected by the particular profession in question. The crisis area in society these days is that the bulk of those leaving our schools have acquired so much knowledge but most of the time there is a "refusal" to do what is expected of their respective professions when it is appropriate after the individuals have learnt what do it. This is what the "abandoned" affective education and assessment should take care and this is a serious weakness in the curriculum of colleges and universities.

### **The Way Forward**

Effort has been made in this paper to establish the fact that in schools, emphasis has been on instruction in the cognitive domain to the neglect of teaching and assessment in the

affective domain. As highlighted in the paper also, several reasons have been put forward to justify this neglect. For example, as mentioned earlier, it is argued that the cognitive domain is relatively easy to assess while the affective domain is said to be contentious. However, going by the implications of this continued neglect of teaching and assessment in the affective domain in favour of the cognitive domain as discussed in this paper, it can be put forward without contradiction that unless the necessary balance between the affective and the cognitive domains in schools is well restored and the move started without further delay in a significant way, time will doubly prove the educational experience in colleges and universities to be incomplete. Should this happen, then the implications that are emanating now as a result of the imbalance will only be a tip of the ice bag because by then the consequences would have become aggravated. The bottom line therefore is that the critical importance of affective assessment and affective education in “whole person development” can no longer be ignored in 21<sup>st</sup> century education.

If there will be appreciable result, then the modality of redressing the said imbalance between the cognitive and the affective domains in the curriculum must be comprehensive in nature and properly coordinated by relevant authorities’. There are pockets of efforts being made here and there but this is not enough. For example, Shephard (2008) points out that one area where affective outcomes are now openly and successfully being sought in some countries is health sciences. Doctors, nurses and related health professionals are trained to heal but their training also seeks to ensure that they display caring attitudes towards their patients (Shephard, 2008). This involves setting learning outcomes that include affective attributes and using learning and teaching activities that promote their attainment (Howe, 2003). Selection process are also tailored to eliminate those with embedded inappropriate attitude while educational processes are put in place to further enhance appropriate attitudes in those selected. A practice of this nature if incorporated into every other profession in a systematic and comprehensive way will be a means of giving affective education and assessment the deserving place.

Certain learning and teaching activities are most successful in encouraging learners to move through the affective domain’s hierarchy (Shephard, 2008). For example in a general learning and teaching context- discussion, open debate, peer involvement, role playing, problem based learning, engaging with role models, simulations, games, group analysis of case studies, expert engagement, perspective sharing and reflection, appropriate use of multimedia to trigger responses – all provide the main stay of learning activities in those areas of higher education where affective outcomes are sought (Shephard, 2005, Howe, 2003). These activities, if well handled and integrated by educators will go a long way in fostering the teaching and assessing of affective characteristics.

Unlike during the Student Assessment Movement of the late 1970’s & early 1980’s, computerized, more recent, more valid and more reliable affective assessment instruments are now available for those who will avail themselves of the usage (Saxon & Calderwood, 2008). Some of the available affective assessment instruments according to Saxon & Calderwood are: Achievement Motivation Profile (AMP), BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-1), Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ), College Student Needs Assessment Survey (CSNAS), Noncognitive Questionnaire (NCQ), Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ), Perceptions, Expectations, Emotions and Knowledge about College (PEEK). Institutional decision makers as well as developmental educators however will have to keep pace with developments in the area of affective assessments so that they can be aware of the variety of affective assessment instrument that are currently available. With the availability of these affective instruments in different varieties now, the onus is on Institutional decision makers and developmental educators to also give attention to how these instruments can be used in the assessment process (Gerlaugh et al 2007).

Concerning the controversy over the form and content of affective education, the establishment of private schools based on any of the forms of absolutism or private schools based on developmentalist philosophy is an option on one hand. Individuals in the society who wish to attend private schools can make a choice. Those who embrace absolutist views have the legal right to establish and or patronize private schools where such views are expressed. Absolutists believe in the indoctrination and inculcation of their beliefs. Since the developmental version of affective education reflects the civil rights guaranteed in democratic societies, one expects that the public schools will embrace the developmental view of affective education and give opportunity to member of the public to benefit.

The measurement of important personal and social qualities, including affect, cannot occur directly. Unlike the measurement of height and weight, which involve the use of well calibrated and standardized tools that directly measure stable qualities, the measurement of temperament, personality, attitudes, feelings, emotions, and values may involve the use of tools that are not as well calibrated. However, methods have been devised to help overcome these and other potential difficulties associated with the assessment of affective qualities. Such methods include: The use of observations, interviews, self-report, naturalistic inquiries, questionnaires, surveys, and other forms of measures. Measurement generally is enhanced when information from various informed and knowledgeable sources is considered. For example, when working with adolescents, measurement of important affective traits may be enhanced by acquiring information directly from the target adolescents as well as from their parents and siblings, teachers, friends and other peers, together with others who are very close to them. The acquisition of information from other sources may be particularly beneficial when the traits being measured are displayed externally (as opposed to ones, like preferences, that are displayed internally), the qualities being assessed are less reliable (e.g. moods), and the psychometric properties of the measures are weak. The availability of information from various sources enables professionals to determine its completeness and consistency. Generally, information that is more complete as well as consistent is more valid and more reliable.

Furthermore, an accurate understanding of one important trait is enhanced by information about various other important traits. For example, an understanding of qualities associated with extroversion-introversion generally is enhanced by knowledge of a person's age, gender, intelligence, achievement, language, self concept, and other important qualities.

Though criticisms concerning affective education have always been laid at the doorstep of the school, total responsibility for affective education is not such that the school alone should be saddled with, neither will the effort of the school alone bring in a comprehensive and appreciable results should the school assume total responsibility. Parents, religious organizations, courts, youth organizations, the media, specialized government agencies and the entire society need to be brought on board because in the real sense, everybody is a stakeholder in education. Though the school should not go solo but it must take the lead. This will amount to a lot of work for teachers and educators. They must be sufficiently motivated to put in their very best. It is therefore important that this onerous responsibility be adequately compensated for in terms of commensurate remuneration.

Particularly, Institutional administrators, educator, assessment specialists will also need to come on board and ensure that regular conferences, workshops and in-service trainings are carried out in the area of affective characteristics and their assessment in schools with the outcome of such exercise strategically and wisely disseminated. The relevant authorities will also need to make available Research grants in the area of affective characteristics and their assessment in schools. To follow this up, Institutions and individuals are to be encouraged to apply for these grants and carry out in-depth research that will further address current and anticipated issues in the area of affective education and affective assessment. Some of the issues that the academia needs to focus upon for solution include:

- What methods of affective education would be legitimate to adopt in a situation where young learners do not have the capacity to think logically at higher cognitive levels?
- What happens if genuinely and carefully formulated values and actions go contrary to established school values and traditions?
- What public value may be promoted within the scope of the law such that the rights of the learners and the rights of the society will both be protected?

These and many other issues about affective education and affective assessment can definitely not be sorted out in one go. However the journey towards solution must start actively and in a coordinated and comprehensive way somewhere. If this is done, before long, the needed balance between affective and cognitive domains will be restored and educational experience will be complete and rewarding.

### **Conclusion**

From the fore going, it is obvious that affective education and assessment are necessary conditions for effective education. If the necessary balance between the affective and the cognitive domains is well restored in all colleges and universities and kept effectively restored, there would be a dramatic difference in the quality of college and university graduates as their educational experience would be comprehensive. In the light of this there must be a quick end to being enamored only with knowledge acquisition. The impression that is long been given that cognitive thinking education is equal to academic courses devoid of affective education is not only misleading but counterproductive.

### **References**

- Adeyemi, I.I. & Esere, O.M. (2009) Assessment in Nigerian Schools: A counselor's Viewpoint. *Edo Journal of Counseling*, Vol 2 NO 1. May.
- Anderson, L.W. (1981). *Assessing Affective Characteristics in Schools*. Ally & Bacon, Boston.
- Atwoli, L. Mungla, P.A. Ndugu, N.M. Kinoti, C.K. & Ogot, M.E. (2011). Prevalence of substance use among College Students in Eldoret, Western Kenyan. *BMC Psychiatry*.
- Barnett, R. (2004). Learning for an unknown future. *High Education Research and Development*, 23 (3), 247 -260.
- Barnett, R. (2004) Learning for an unknown future. *High Education Research and Development*, 23, 247-260.
- Beane, A.J. (1986). *The Continuing Controversy over Affective Education*. Educational Leadership. January.
- Bennett, J. Gouws, A. Kritzinger, A. Harmes, M. Tidimane, C. (2007). "Gender is Over": Researching the Implementation of Sexual Harassment Policies in Southern African Higher Education 1.
- Birbeck, D. (2009). Graduate qualities and the affective domain: New Horizons to explore. Adelaide University of South Australia.
- Birbeck, D. (2008), Graduate Qualities and the affective domain; New horizons to explore. Occasional Papers on Learning and teaching at UniSa – Paper 1.

- Birbeck, D & Andre, K (2009), The affective domain: beyond simply knowing, ATN Conference, RMIT University.
- Bloom, B.S, Engelhart, M.D, Furst, E.J, Hill, WH, & Krathwohl, D.R (Eds) (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives; The classification of educational goals. Handbook I; The cognitive domain. New York; David McKay Co Inc.
- Boud, D. & Falchikov, N. (2006). Aligning assessment with long term learning. *Assessment and evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(40), 399-413.
- Chege, F. (2006b). Memories of Childhood violence: Life Cycle reflections by African Students teachers. Report presented to UNICEF, ESARO for UN Secretary General's Study on Violence against children.
- Colby, A, & Sullivan, W.M.(2009).Strengthening the foundations of students' excellence, integrity, and social contribution, *Liberal Education*,95(1)22-29.
- Combs, A. ( 1972). Helping Teachers Change their Values. In *Developing Value Construct in Schooling Inquiry into Process and Product*. Edited by James Phillip. Washington Ohio Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Combs, A, ed (1962). *Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming*. Washington DC. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Crebert, G,Bates, M, Bell, B, Patrick, CJ, & Cragolini,V. (2004), Developing generic skills at university,during work placement and in employment;graduates' perception. *High Education Research and Development*, 23(2), 147 -165.
- Dewey, J.(1939). *Theory of Valuation*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dicken, B. (2007). Crain's Cleveland Business, *Higher Education*, p15, October 1.
- Forde, L. & Hope, W. (2008). The impact of sexual abuse on Ghananian schoolgirls' family relationships. In M. Dunne(ed) *Gender, Sexuality and Development:Education and Development in sub SaharanAfrica*. Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, 133-146.
- Fuller U & Keim, B (2007), Should we assess our students' attitudes? Paper presented at the Seventh Baltic Sea Conference on Computing Education Research, Finland.
- Green, M.(2006). Bullying in Schools: a plea for measure of rights, *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 62: 1, pp.63-79.
- Gerlaugh, K. Thompson, L. Boylan, H & Davies, H. (2007). National Study of developmental Education 11. Baseline data for community colleges. *Research in Development Education*, 20(4), 1-4.
- Ghoneem, K.A.R. (2012). Attitudes of Princess Rahma College Students towards University Violence. *International Education Studies*. Vol. 5, No 3.
- Griffith, G.K & Nguyen, D.A. (2006). Are Educators Prepared to Affect the Affective Domain? *National Forum of Teacher Education, Journal-Electronic*. Volume 16 Number 3E, 2005-2006.
- Gronlund, N.E., & Brookhart, S.M.(2009). *Writing instructional objectives (8<sup>th</sup> ed)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ; Pearson Education.
- Gronlund, N.E.(1991). *How to write and use instructional objectives(4<sup>th</sup> ed)* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Howe, A. (2003), "Twelve tips for developing professional attitudes in training", *Medical Teacher*, Vol 25. No 5, PP. 485 -7.
- Ipaye, B. (1986). *Continuous assessment in schools with some counseling implications*. Ilorin: University of Ilorin Press.
- Iyewarun, S.A. (1986). Traditional methods of examination: Need for a revision. *Journal of Science Teachers Association of Nigeria*, 17(3), 146-161.

- Kohlberg, L. (1975). *The Cognitive Development Approach to Moral Education*. Phi Delta Kappan 61(670-677).
- Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S. & Masia, B.B. (1964) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook 2: The Affective Domain*, London, Longman, Green and Co Ltd.
- Krebs, P.C. Lindquist, H.C. Warner, D.T. Fisher, S.B. & Martin, L.S. (2007). *The campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study prepared for U.S. National Institute of Justice*, Washington, DC. Document No:221153. Award No: 2004-WG-BX-0010.
- Leach, F. & Mitchell, C. (2006) [Ed] *Combating Gender Violence in and around Schools*, [Introduction] Stoke-on-Trent, UK & Sterling, USA.
- Lewin, K.M.(2007). *Expanded Access to Secondary Schooling in Sub-Saharan Africa: KeyPlanning and Financing Issues, Create Pathways To Access: Research Monograph NO 8*, Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Maas Weigert, K, (2006), "Justice, integrity and action: individuals and institutions", *Improving University Teaching*, paper presented at 31<sup>st</sup> International Conference, available at [www.iutconference.org/2006/pdfs/MaasWeigert.pdf](http://www.iutconference.org/2006/pdfs/MaasWeigert.pdf).
- Menix, K.D. (1996). *Domains of learning: Interdependent components of achievable learning outcomes*. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 27(5), 200-208.
- Miller, M. (2005) "Learning and teaching in the affective domain", in Orey, M.(Ed.) *College of Education eBook University of Georgia*, Athens.
- Miller, G, Frank D, R. & Getto, C. (1989). *Non Cognitive criteria for assessing students in North American Medical Schools*. *Acad. Med.* 64, 42-45.
- Nolting, P. (2007) *Winning at math(5<sup>th</sup>)* Bradenton, FL: Academic Success Press Inc.
- Nooman, H.J. & Vavra, C.M. (2007). *Crime in Schools and Colleges: A Study of Offenders and Arrestees. Reported via National Incident Based Reporting System Data*. Crime Analysis, Research Development Unit. Criminal Justice Information Services Division, US Dept of Justice.
- Oakland, T. (1997) *Affective Assessment*. Paper presented at CONPE, Rio de Janeiro, 1997.
- Obe, E.O. (1996). *School discipline and remedies*. Lagos: Premier Press & Publishers.
- Obe, E.O. (1986). *A survey of the attitude of some Lagos secondary school teachers towards continuous assessment*. *Journal of Research in Curriculum*, 1 (10), 9-16.
- Oguneye, W. (2002). *Continuous assessment : Practice and Prospects*. Lagos:Providence Publishers.
- Okon, S.E. (1986), *Guidance for the 6-3-34 system of education: A new approach*. Ibadan. University Press Ltd.
- Olubor, R.O. & Ogonor, B.O. (2007). *Instructional activities of Staff personnel in the affective domain in selected secondary schools in Southern Nigeria*. *International Education Journal*, 8(1), 82-88.
- Paice, E., Heard, S. and Moss, F. (2002), *How important are role models in making good doctors?"* *BMJ*, Vol. 325, pp707-10.
- Phenix, P. (1969). *The Moral Imperative in Contemporary American Education*. *Perspectives in Education*.
- Pierre, E, & Oughton, J, (2007). *The affective Domain: Undiscovered Country*. *College Quarterly*, 10(4),1-7.
- Popham, W.J. (2011 ). *Classroom Assessment: What teachers need to know*. Boston, M.A: Pearson.

- Raths, L.E. Merrill, H. Sidney, S.B. (1978). *Values and Teaching*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Columbus, Ohio. Charles, E. Merrill.
- Raths, L.E. (1972). *Meeting the needs of children ; Creating Trust and security*. Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill.
- Raths, L.E (1975). *Social Change and Values, Impact on Instructional Improvement*.(10) 8-11.
- Rigby, K & Slee, P.T. (1993) *Dimensions of interpersonal relating among Australian school children and their implications for psychological well –being*, *Journal of Sociological Psychology*, Vol. 33, pp.33-42.
- Rigby, K.(2003). *Consequences of bullying in schools*, *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol 48, N0 9, pp.583-590.
- Rotimi, A. (2005). *Violence in the Citadel: The Menace of Secret Cults in the Nigerian Universities*. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*. 14(1): 79 -98.
- Russell, M. (2004). *The importance of the affective domain in further education classroom culture*. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 9(2), 249-270.
- Sarmah, S. (2012). *Newton Patch*. <http://newton.patch.com/search/articles>
- Saxon, P. & Calderwood, B.(2008). *Affective Assessment for Developmental Students, Part 1*.*Research in Developmental Education*. Vol. 22, Issue 1, 2008. Appalachian State University.
- Shephard, K, (2009). *Higher education for sustainability: Seeking affective learning outcomes*. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 9(1), 87-98.
- Shobayo, I. (2002). *Suspected Cultist kill two Unijos students*. *Nigerian Tribune*. 17<sup>th</sup> October, p8.
- Smith, P.L., & Ragan, T.J.(1999). *Instructional design*. New York: John Willey & Sons, Inc.
- Sterling, M. (1967). *What Task for Schools*. *Saturday Review* 49. January 14.
- Stiggins, R.J. (2005). *Student-involved assessment for learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Sumsion, J, & Goodfellow, J, (2004). *Identifying generic skills through curriculum mapping: a critical evaluation*. *High Education Research and Development*, 23(3), 329-346.
- Tjavanga, H, & Jotia, A.L. (2012). *School Bullies and Education in Botswana: Impact on Other Students and Academic Performance*. *Academic Research International*. Vol.2. N0 1.January.