

# Domain of Educational Objectives Social Studies Teachers’ Questions Emphasise in Senior High Schools in Ghana.

Isaac Eshun

Department of Social Science, Enchi College of Education.  
Post Office Box 44, Enchi-Western Region, Ghana.

Tel: +233-266634610. E-mail: isaac\_eshun@ymail.com

Michael Franklin Mensah

Social Science Department, Agogo College of Education.

Post Office Box 26, Agogo-Ashanti Region, Ghana

E-mail: m.mensah90@yahoo.com Tel: +233-205883720

## Abstract

This study examined the domain of educational objectives social studies teachers’ questions emphasise in Senior High Schools (SHS) in Ghana. Interpretative research design was used to analyse interviews and document of teachers’ questions designed for students’ end of term examination papers. Non-probability sampling method, that is, convenience and purposive sampling techniques, were used to select the sample of teachers whose end of term social studies questions were analysed.

It was revealed that teachers said they set questions that enhance the development of students’ conceptual understanding or problem-solving skills. However, documentary analysis of their end of term examination papers revealed otherwise. There were discrepancies between what teachers said they assessed and what they actually assessed. It was recommended that there is the need to plan and conduct effective professional development initiatives, including both pre-and in-service training, to transform teachers’ epistemologies in line with the current theories of teaching, learning and assessment in social studies.

**Key-words:** Domain of educational objectives. Social Studies objectives. Affective, Cognitive, and Psychomotor domains.

## 1. Introduction

Teaching and learning are complementary activities, which are formally undertaken in a school context. Teaching describes the action of a teacher that helps students to acquire and retain knowledge, attitude and skills. Learning is associated with behavioural changes in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains (Farrant, 1980). One serious defect in the system of evaluation, which is now being changed, is that the measurement of student achievement was directed mainly towards the measure of cognitive behaviours such as knowledge, understanding and other thinking skills which are usually acquired after exposure to some learning experiences and subject matter knowledge. Also, the present assessment practice neglects the assessment of skills, which are normally associated with personality characteristics of students (Obemeata, 1984) whereas complete assessment must cover all the three domains of educational objectives.

Educational researchers have always emphasized the three domains of educational objectives, which are: cognitive, affective and psychomotor. Cognitive domain mainly emphasizes remembering or reproducing information, which have been learnt. This domain is knowledge or mind based. Affective domain emphasizes feelings and emotion. It also deals with behavioural aspects and beliefs. Psychomotor deals with manipulation of materials and objectives (Krathwohl & Bloom, 1993).

According to Miller (2005), the affective domain of learning reflects the values and beliefs we place on the information we have. Social Studies as a subject encourages the development of socio-civic and personal behaviour. Its focus is on the affective domain of learning. This therefore goes to say that, the assessment of the affective domain of learning needs to be popular amongst Social Studies teachers in order to prepare students for citizenship responsibility. The attainment of a responsible student is the result of the functioning of his whole personality; therefore apart from assessment of the cognitive domain, the affective and psychomotor domains must also be given paramount place when assessing learner’s outcomes. With this, Pierre and Oughton (2007) claim that although many college teachers outline and plan lessons with affective outcomes, they fail to indicate how these will be taught and evaluated. Affective outcomes are derived from effective teaching method. Eshun (2013:17) asserts that, “teaching Social Studies is stressed to be done in student-centred techniques and strategies.” The author, further stressed that, brainstorming, role-playing, simulation, discussion and debate were the major techniques stressed by both colleges of education curriculum and the Junior High School (JHS) social studies syllabus in Ghana. This makes it prudent for the Social Studies teacher to be familiar with the major objectives in the subject area in order to formulate objectives in all the domains of learning following the different classifications by Bloom (1956), Krathwohl (1956) and Taba (1962).

It appears that instructional testing has always placed more emphasis on the low-order level of thinking. The quality of test depends on the ability of the individual to capture most if not all skills in thinking, from the content taught in the curriculum. A well-set test requires a skilful individual. Thus in most of the private and public schools, standardized tests have been employed (Lyman, 1998). It should also be noted that students learn best when they are asked questions that would require them to apply the skill on thinking and reasoning as suggested by Bloom, since application of them would promote citizenship. So, Social Studies teachers need to employ them as a practice to prepare the child for citizenship responsibility.

This brings us to the issue of the questions teachers use in assessing students in the teaching and learning of Social Studies. One of the major duties of a Social Studies teacher is to promote thought and inspire inquiry in students, and one effective way of doing this, is through proper questioning in the classroom. Caram and Davis (2005) emphasized that, when teachers' questions are used correctly, it can enhance student learning by developing critical thinking skills, reinforce student understanding, correct student misunderstanding, provide feedback for students and enliven classroom discussions. Teacher's questions are of significant values for many instructional purposes, eliciting student reflection and challenging deeper student understanding and engagement in the classroom.

According to Croom and Stair (2005), classroom questions are best used as problem-solving tools to help indicate students' academic progress or to assess students' critical thinking skills. This was supported by Vogler (2005) that questions can monitor comprehension, help make connections to prior learning and can stimulate cognitive growth. Classroom teachers are aware that it is possible to transfer factual knowledge and conceptual understanding through the process of asking questions.

In view of Danielson (1996:47), "good and skilled classroom questions, when carefully crafted and framed engage students in a true exploration of the content and allow the students to exhibit their understanding of the concept taught". Whereas, unskilled classroom questions from the teachers focus on short-answers, low-level questions just check for students' knowledge. Danielson also called these types of questions as "recitation questions" rather than "in depth discussion questions". In Social Studies classrooms, teachers' questions are vital components of proper understanding of facts, concepts and generalisations which is an effective way of learning. In the view of Fisher (1995:76), teachers' questions give the children the opportunity to connect what they know with what they needed to examine and reflect on in their own thinking.

Questioning has been, for thousands of years, one of the most popular modes of teaching (Tan, 2007) and research attention has been paid to teacher questions (Guan Eng Ho, 2005). According to Ornstein & Lasley (2000), good questioning is both a methodology and an art. Therefore, if used well it can make a significant contribution to improve teaching, learning and assessment. Petty (1993) noted that questioning can also be used to evaluate the learning of students. According to Danielson (cited in Latham, 1997), questioning is used for students assessment and also enables teachers to engage students in higher-order thinking process and stimulate their curiosity. All these suggest that there are variety of purposes and reasons for asking questions in Social Studies classrooms by teachers. In this vein, Aggarwal (1982:84) succinctly caution that "Social Studies more than any other subject demands well prepared conscious men and women of sound knowledge and training, whose personalities rank high among men".

According to Quartey (1984), each teacher of Social Studies needs to possess a philosophy of the subject of teaching and learning. The philosophy provides guidance and direction in choosing objectives, and nature of assessment. This goes to support the view of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 2004:54) that the methods course for Social Studies teachers' preparation should focus on the "pedagogical content knowledge that deals specifically with the nature of Social Studies and with ideas, strategies, and techniques for teaching Social Studies at the appropriate level".

The problem under study is that, the domain of educational objectives Social Studies teachers' emphasis in their questions seems to affect the teaching and attainment of the goals of the subject adversely at the Senior High Schools in Ghana. Social Studies assessment, with a focus on the affective domain, occupies a critical position in both Junior High School and Senior High School curriculum in Ghana. The success of instruction can only be determined by a proper evaluation; hence it is important that teachers possess the necessary skills for affective evaluation.

As a result the purpose of the study is to provide an empirical basis for the domain of educational objectives Social Studies teachers emphasize in their assessment in Senior High School level. The objective is therefore to explore the domain of educational objectives Social Studies teachers' questions emphasise.

## **2. Literature Review on Domains of Educational Objectives in Social Studies**

Kellough and Kellough (1999:417) asserted that, "teaching and learning are reciprocal processes that depend on and affect one another". Teaching, according to Borich (2004), is a complex and difficult task that demands extraordinary abilities. According to Kyriacou (1995), effective teaching is essentially concerned with how best to bring about the desired student learning by some educational activities. He further asserts that, from

psychological perspective, teaching is where the implicit emphasis is on identifying observable behaviour in the classroom which can be linked with an influence on observable and measurable product variables. In short, teaching describes the action of a teacher that helps students to acquire and retain knowledge, attitude and skills. Learning, on the other hand, can be viewed as both a product and a process. According to Twigg (1994) many educational psychologists generally defined learning as a “change in behaviour as a result of experiences”. This behaviourist approach assessed learning as an outcome that resulted in some external behavioural activity; however, not all learning leads to overt behaviour. Consequently, other theorists have refined the definition of learning to consider changes in the way people “understand, experience, or conceptualize the world around them” (Ramsden, 1992). This therefore implies that, learning is a multi domain process involving intellect, emotion, and physical skills. In other words, learning is associated with behavioural changes in the cognitive, affective (attitudes and feelings) and psychomotor domains (Farrant, 1980). Further, these domains are connected, and the condition of one influences the others. The attainment of a pupil is the result of the functioning of his whole personality; therefore apart from assessment of the cognitive domain, the affective and psychomotor domains must be given paramount place when assessing learner’s outcomes.

Establishing a comprehensive assessment practices in Social Studies education is very important because Social Studies education encompasses relevant knowledge, right attitudes and skills needed by all citizens in order to make rational decisions and solving personal and societal problems. Therefore, for complete assessment in Social Studies at the Senior High School level, the three domains of educational objectives must be assessed. West African Examination Council (2007), also affirm that assessment of students’ learning behaviour is expected to be carried out in totality. That is assessing the students in all activities in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains.

Whatever type of assessment is considered for use, the starting point for all classroom assessment and evaluation is statement of instructional objectives. Instructional objectives are of two types, the General objectives and specific instructional objectives. General objectives are inclusive in scope, covert in structure, and not easy for classroom assessment while specific objectives are limited in scope, overt and easily lend themselves to measurement because they are open to limited interpretations (Erinosho & Badru, 2000). This means good classroom teaching and assessment should depend on the explicitness of instructional objectives. It is important, therefore, for the Social Studies teachers to be familiar with the major objectives in their subject areas and to practice formulating objectives in all the domains of learning for specific topics following the different classifications by Bloom (1956), Krathwohl (1956) and Taba (1962).

According to Ellis (2002) it is important that teachers recognize the necessity of developing unit or instructional objectives using clear terms in all domains of learning. These objectives will serve as guides to test items or other means of evaluation on the child’s progress. Thus, there is a natural axis that runs from planning through instruction to assessment. Blooms taxonomy of educational objectives is intended to be used as a guide to make unit objectives. Bloom taxonomy of levels of cognitive thinking is used to organize thoughts on thinking and the ability to reason (Barr, 1984). It should be emphasized however that Social Studies teachers usually test the knowledge of the students based on the Blooms learning domains. The hierarchy of learning behaviours was categorized into three interested and overlapping learning domains. These are: a) Cognitive: understanding, facts, mental skills (knowledge), b) Affective: growth in feelings or emotional areas (attitude) and c) Psychomotor: manual or physical skills (skills) (Martins, 2006).

Each of the three domains requires specific considerations, based on the intended learning objectives (Main, 1992). The domains can be taught of as “the goals of instructional process”. According to Nitko (2001), the cognitive domain objectives produce outcomes that focus on knowledge and abilities requiring memory, thinking, and reasoning processes. The affective domain objectives also produce outcomes that focus on feelings, interests, attitudes, dispositions and emotional states. And the psychomotor domain objectives produce outcomes that focus on motor skills and perceptual processes.

Bloom’s taxonomy can help Social Studies teachers to bring to mind the wide range of important learning objectives and thinking skills to avoid narrowly focusing on some lower level objectives only. Although, the three domains have different explanations, they are closely related in two ways: first, single major objective can involve learning in two or even all three domains and second, attitudinal development may even precede successful learning in the other domains. This study therefore describes in details these three learning domains.

The behaviour most commonly assessed in schools is in the cognitive domain. The cognitive domain deals with all mental processes including perception, memory and information processing by which the learner or the individual acquires knowledge, solves problems and plans for the future. In the words of Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, and Krathwohl (1956) cognitive domain involves knowledge and the development of intellectual skills. This includes the recall or recognition of specific facts, procedural patterns, and concepts that serve in the development of intellectual abilities and skills. This means, in Social Studies education, the cognitive learning

domain is exhibited by learner’s intellectual abilities which are characterized by observable and unobservable skills such as comprehending information, organizing ideas, and evaluating information and actions.

Basically, there are two parts to the cognitive domain and these include: (a) “one would be the simple behaviour of remembering or recalling knowledge, and the other, the more complex behaviours of the abilities and skills and (b) the critical thinking, or the ability to apply the knowledge gained through instruction” (Bloom, 1956:28). The bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive domain is used because it is easily understood and is probably the most widely applied one in use today. According to Bloom, et al, (1956) there are six levels of objectives in cognitive domain. Thus, there are six major categories, which are listed in order in Table 1. Below, starting from the simplest behaviour to the most complex. This implies the first ones must normally be mastered before the next ones can take place.

**Table 1: Cognitive Domain of Learning**

Major Categories	Description	Key Words
<b>Knowledge</b>	Remembering previously learned material, from specific facts to complete theories, but all that is required is recall. That is, ability to recall previously learned material.	Defines, describes, identifies, knows, labels, lists, matches, names, recalls, recognises, reproduces, selects, states.
<b>Comprehension</b>	The ability to grasp or construct meaning from material. (Lowest level of understanding).	Comprehends, converts, defends, distinguishes, estimates, explains, extends, generalizes, infers, interprets, paraphrases, predicts, rewrites, summarizes, translates.
<b>Application</b>	Ability to use learned material, or to implement material in new and concrete situations.	Applies, changes, demonstrates, discovers, constructs, manipulates, modifies, relates, operates, predicts, prepares, solves, uses.
<b>Analysis</b>	Separate concepts or material into component parts and show relationships between parts. Distinguish facts from inference.	Analyses, compares, contrasts, differentiates, discriminate, identifies, illustrates, infers, separates.
<b>Synthesis</b>	The ability to put parts together to form a coherent or unique new whole, with emphasis on creating a new meaning, structure or relationships.	Categorises, combines, compiles, composes, creates, designs, explains, modifies, organises, plans, relates, revises.
<b>Evaluation</b>	The ability to judge the worth of material against defined or stated criteria	Appraises, compares, concludes, contrasts, criticises, defends, describes, explains, discriminates, evaluates, interprets, justifies, relates, summarises.

**Source: Adapted from Bloom, et al., (1956)**

These six categories arranged on scale of difficulty, meaning that a learner who is able to perform at the higher levels of the taxonomy, is demonstrating a more complex level of cognitive thinking.

Many schemas have been proposed to describe the processes of the cognitive domain. Quellmalz (1985) proposed a similar cognitive taxonomy to Bloom’s and includes five categories: recall, analysis, comparison, inference, and evaluation. Anderson & Krathwohl (2001) also revised Bloom’s taxonomy incorporating both levels of thinking and kinds of knowledge. This expanded technology allows teachers and instructional designers to efficiently align learning objectives and assessment strategies. The new terms in the revised Bloom’s Taxonomy are defined in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Revised Bloom's Taxonomy**

Major Category	Meaning
<b>Remembering</b>	Retrieving, recognizing, and recalling relevant knowledge from long term memory
<b>Understanding</b>	Constructing meaning from oral, written, and graphic messages through interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.
<b>Applying</b>	Carrying out or using a procedure through executing, or implementing.
<b>Analyzing</b>	Breaking material into constituent parts, determining how the parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose through differentiating, organizing, and attributing.
<b>Evaluating</b>	Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.
<b>Creating</b>	Putting elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganizing elements into a new pattern or structure through generating, planning, or producing

**Source: Anderson & Krathwohl, (2001:67)**

Although taxonomies differ in the particular levels or categories they include, their most important function is to remind teachers of the distinction between higher-level and lower-level cognitive performances. In general, any cognitive performance or thinking that involves more than rote memorization or recall is considered to be higher-level. This implies, the knowledge and comprehension levels of Bloom's taxonomy, the remembering level of Anderson & Krathwohl taxonomy or the recall level of Quellmalz's taxonomy represent lower-level cognitive performances. This therefore means that, Social Studies teachers' classroom instruction and assessment should focus upon teaching students higher-order thinking skills that go beyond rote memorization.

The second domain of behaviour which needs to be emphasized is the affective domain. Martin and Briggs (1986) once identified the notion of affective domain as it encompasses all behaviours concerned with emotions and feelings. Similarly, Martin and Reigeluth (1999:486) also claimed that "affective domain refers to components of affective development focusing on internal changes or processes, or to categories of behaviour within affective education as a process or end-product".

Along with the efforts to define the affective domain, researchers have come to an agreement that the affective domain is a categorical term as a super-ordinate category and identified parts or components of the domain which improves the clarity on the scope and boundary of the domain (Gephart & Ingle, 1976; Martin & Briggs, 1986; Snow, 1989). Even though, components of the domain vary from researchers to researchers. For example, Bloom, Masia, and Krathwohl (1964) included attitudes, feelings, and values, while Ringness (1975) listed interests, tastes, preferences, attitude, value, moral, character, and personality adjustment. Hoepfner (1972) included temperament, trait, attitude, belief, interest, and value as important aspects, while Gephart and Ingle (1976) differentiated physiological responses (perspiration, heart rate, respiration, and visceral) from psycho-social behaviours and responses (attitudes, beliefs, values, emotions, and perceptions). Snow (1989) identified

goals, motives and values as core components of the affective domain, while Martin and Briggs (1986) cited self-concept, motivation, interest, attitude, belief, value, self-esteem, morality, ego development, feeling, need achievement, locus of control, curiosity, creativity, independence, mental health, personal growth, group dynamics, mental imagery, and personality as being associated with the affective domain. Himsl and Lambert (1993) identified self-esteem, interpersonal relationships, world awareness, motivation, and spiritual life as affective components while Zytowski (1994) identified needs, values, preferences, interests, traits, and attitudes. Hattie, Biggs, and Purdie (1996) included motivation, belief, value, interest, and the self-concept. Most recently, Lynch (2009) and the collaborators included internalization of interest, attitudes, and values, and Clayton and Sankar (2009) included attitudes, beliefs, feelings, and motivations.

A learner's attitude, interest, attention, awareness and values are demonstrated by affective behaviours which are organized in a hierarchical format, starting from simplest and building to most complexes (Martins, 2006). However, the taxonomy of affective behaviours proposed by Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964) is referred to and used most commonly. This is shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Affective Domain of Learning**

Major Categories	Description	Key Words
<b>Receiving</b>	Awareness, willing to devote attention to particular topic or activity.	Asks, chooses, describes, follows, gives, holds, identifies, locates, names, points to, selects, sits, erects, replies, uses.
<b>Responding</b>	Active participation where motivation is not to just to attend, but to become involved with activity and gain satisfaction from engaging in it.	Answers, assists, aids, complies, conforms, discusses, greets, helps, labels, performs, practices, presents, reads, recites, reports, selects, tells, writes.
<b>Valuing</b>	Places value on subject and activity. Motivated not by desire to simply comply, but by commitment to underlying value guiding behaviour.	Completes, demonstrates, differentiates, explains, follows, forms, initiates, invites, joins, justifies, proposes, reads, reports, selects, shares, studies, works.
<b>Organisation</b>	Organises values by contrasting them, resolving conflicts between them, and creating own value system.	Adheres, alters, arranges, combines, compares, completes, defends, explains, formulates, generalizes, identifies, integrates, modifies, orders, organizes, prepares, relates, synthesizes.
<b>Internalizing values</b>	Adopt values and behaviours that become pervasive, consistent, predictable, and characteristic of learner.	Acts, discriminates, displays, influences, listens, modifies, performs, practices, proposes, qualifies, questions, revises, serves, solves, verifies.

**Source: Adapted from Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia, (1964)**

Generally, all affective taxonomies are based upon the degree of a person's involvement in some activity or issue. The lower levels of affective taxonomies describe superficial involvement such as paying attention, whereas the higher levels deal with deeper involvement such as interest, commitment or valuing.

The final behaviour domain is the psychomotor domain, which includes behaviours of a physical and manipulative nature. In the words of Simpson (1972), psychomotor domain refers to the use of basic motor skills, coordination, and physical movement. Bloom's research group did not develop in-depth categories of this domain, claiming lack of experience in teaching these skills. However, Simpson (1972), cited in Martin (2006) developed seven psychomotor categories to support Blooms domain. These seven major categories are listed from the simplest behaviour to the most complex as shown in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Psychomotor Domain of Learning**

Major Categories	Description	Key Words
<b>Perception</b>	The ability to use sensory cues to guide motor activity. This ranges from sensory stimulation, through cue selection, to translation.	Chooses, describes, detects, differentiates, distinguishes, identifies, isolates, relates, selects.
<b>Set</b>	Readiness to act. It includes mental, physical, and emotional sets.	Begins, displays, explains, moves, proceeds, reacts, shows, states, volunteers.
<b>Guided Response</b>	The early stages in learning a complex skill that includes imitation and trial and error.	Copies, traces, follows, react, reproduce, responds
<b>Mechanism</b>	This is the intermediate stage in learning a complex skill.	Assembles, calibrates, constructs, dismantles, displays, fastens, fixes, grinds, heats, manipulates, measures, mends, mixes, organizes, sketches.
<b>Complex Overt Response</b>	The skilful performance of motor acts that involve complex movement patterns.	Assembles, builds, calibrates, constructs, dismantles, displays, fastens, fixes, grinds, heats, manipulates, measures, mends, mixes, organizes, sketches.
<b>Adaptation</b>	Skills are well developed and the individual can modify movement patterns to fit special requirements.	Adapts, alters, changes, rearranges, reorganizes, revises, varies.
<b>Origination</b>	A learners ability to create new movement patterns to fit a particular situation or specific problem.	Arranges, builds, combines, composes, constructs, creates, designs, initiate, makes, originates.

**Adapted from Martin (2006)**

This physical behaviour is learned through repetitive practice. A learner's ability to perform these skills is based on precision, speed, distance, and technique (Clark in Martin, 2006). The psychomotor domain is also skill based and this will enable students to produce a product. Since the above discussion centred on the domains of educational objectives in Social Studies, it is quite relevant that teachers be abreast with the educational objectives in the Senior High School Social Studies syllabus. This goes to suggest that teachers need to be knowledgeable of the goals and objectives of Social Studies in order to become effective in teaching and assessing students in the subject.

The 2007 and 2010 Senior High School Social Studies Syllabus designers claim that, the subject prepares the individual to fit into society by equipping him or her with knowledge about the ways of life of their society, its

problems, its values and its hopes for the future (Curriculum Research Development Division (CRDD), 2007; 2010). As a subject, Social Studies helps students to understand their society better; helps them to investigate how their society functions and hence assists them to be critical and at the same time develop the kind of mind that transforms societies. If students understand the Ghanaian society better, and are able to examine the society's institutions' ways of life with a critical and constructive mind, the country will be on the path to better and faster growth and development. This calls for the investigation of the domain of educational objectives social studies teachers' questions emphasise in senior high schools in Ghana. This is because an important concern of education today includes maintaining standards of excellence and greater accountability for results.

To realize such concerns depends upon each academic discipline, making efforts to achieve its objectives. The objectives which are spelt out in the definition of a discipline form the basis for developing curriculum, instructional methods, equipments and assessment techniques. The National Council for the Social Studies in America (NCSS, 1996:23) has endorsed that the primary purpose of Social Studies is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society in an interdependent world.

The Senior High School Social Studies syllabus (CRDD, 2007; 2010), identifies broad categories of objectives of Social Studies to include the Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives, namely Cognitive, Affective and Psychomotor. These are general objectives that must be adequately broken into specific objectives during instruction, based on the teacher's adequate knowledge in the subject. Also, Dynneson and Gross (1999:6) affirms that the overall instructional goals of Social Studies are often related to the following concerns:

- to prepare students for a changing world,
- to broaden students' perspectives and understanding of the community, nation and world,
- to provide students with the knowledge, skills and abilities they need in both their personal and public lives,
- to help students draw and synthesize knowledge, skills and values that are characteristics of Social Science subject matter,
- to contribute to students' understanding of what it means to live in a complex and pluralistic society,
- to provide students with an understanding of the means and processes of a representative form of government,
- to encourage students to participate in the affairs of society and to work towards establishing a good society, and
- to promote important social goals associated with democratic living.

Also, the general aims provided in the 2007 and 2010 Social Studies syllabus for Senior High School (CRDD 2007; 2010) in Ghana read as follows:

- develop the ability to adapt to the developing and ever-changing Ghanaian society;
- develop positive attitudes and values toward individuals and societal issues;
- develop critical and analytical skills in accessing issues for objective decision making;
- develop national consciousness and unity;
- develop enquiry and problem-solving skills for solving personal and societal problems; and
- become responsible citizens capable and willing to contribute to societal advancement.

All the objectives that the different authorities came up with, point to one thing, that is, training for citizenship. Social Studies education, in its broadest terms, has the goal of helping students figure out what they know to be true about their social situation and equipping them with the necessary analytical and self-reflective tools to successfully navigate their world (Ross, 2000). This affirms that, it is important to stress that the attitudes, values and skills, to be developed should be guided by the established concepts and the objectives and goals of the subject. It is realized that children who are involved in programmes that are goal directed become skilful, physically fit, knowledgeable and caring (Grineski, 1993).

### **3. Methodology**

Interpretative design was used for the study. Non-probability sampling method (purposive and convenience techniques) was used to select respondents for the study. The researchers interviewed ten trained social studies graduates using semi-structured interview guide and analysed documents on end of term examination papers. End of term examination of Social Studies questions were collected from five (5) trained Social Studies teachers at Senior High School level. The question papers provided by five teachers were used for their end of second term examination for the third year students at the time of conducting the research. The examination papers were in two sections (A and B). The section 'A' part of the paper was made up of objective tests, whilst section 'B' part constituted the essay type of test. In all, a total of two hundred and ninety-nine (299) questions were collected from the five teachers. The interviews were conducted first before the documentary analysis. This was done to crosschecked whether what they said in the interview have reflection on the questions they set.

Documents on Social Studies teachers' end of term examination questions were analyzed according to the Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom, *et al.* 1964). It was analysed based on the following two (2) analyses process created by the researchers:

1. Domains of educational objectives teachers' questions emphasize; and
2. Levels of knowledge teachers' questions emphasise within each of the domains of learning.

#### 4. Domains of Educational Objectives and Teachers' Questions

##### 4.1 Domain of Educational Objectives Teachers Question Emphasise

The domains of educational objectives that Social Studies teacher's questions emphasize are discussed here using Table 5.

**Table 5: Distribution of Examination Question as per Various Domains of Learning**

Domains of Learning	Teachers					Total (%)
	A (%)	B (%)	C (%)	D (%)	E (%)	
Cognitive	61(20.4)	60 (20.1)	53 (17.7)	55 (18.4)	70 (23.4)	299 (100)
Affective	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Psychomotor	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

A, B, C, D & E - Teachers

Table 5 gives the distribution of the end of term examination questions according to various teachers (A, B, C, D, and E) and the domains of educational objectives. Out of the 299 questions, 61 (20.4%) were set by Teacher A, 60 (20.1%) by Teacher B, 53(17.7%) by Teacher C, 55(18.4%) by Teacher D, whilst 70(23.4%) by Teacher E. The result of the analysis reveals that all the 299 questions were in the cognitive domain whilst, no question (0%) was set on affective and psychomotor domains of learning. The above shows that all the five teachers (A, B, C, D and E) questions do not emphasize the whole domains of educational objectives but they all emphasized only the cognitive domain at the expense of the other domains.

Again, for further clarification on the analysis of the examination questions set by teachers, question 1 on the interview guide which is - *what are the domains of learning do you always measure in your class exercises and end of term exam and why?* was asked. With this question, 4(40%) out of the 10 interviewees said they do concentrate on the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of learning in their class exercise and end of term examination, 2(20%) said they do concentrate on cognitive and affective alone, 3(30%) said they concentrate on cognitive domain alone whilst, 1(10%) said that they use the affective domain of learning only. The above shows that only 4(40%) out of the 10 respondents who were interviewed emphasize or cover all the three domains of educational objectives. This finding is supported by the submission of Erinosh and Badru (2000) that cognitive domain is the most relevant for school subjects and comfortable to measure. As indicated in the literature, affective learning is concepts that many teachers are not likely to know that they can be taught and therefore, they pay little attention to its pedagogy (Plutchik, 1982). In a similar vein, Meredith, Forthner and Mullins (1997) assert that affective teaching and learning as well as its assessment is often neglected because it is a phenomenon that is poorly understood. This implies students are always taught facts and how these facts are memorized for examination purposes. This was also against the focus of Bloom, et al, (1964) in their taxonomy of educational objectives that was developed for cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains.

##### 4.2 Levels of Knowledge Teachers' Questions Emphasise

The level of knowledge emphasised in Social Studies teachers' questions is discussed here using Table 6.

**Table 6: Levels of Knowledge measured in Teachers' Examination Questions**

Cognitive Level	Teachers					Total (%)
	A (%)	B (%)	C (%)	D (%)	E (%)	
Knowledge for recall	42 (68.9)	31 (51.7)	37 (69.8)	30 (54.5)	50 (71.4)	190 (63.5)
Comprehension	11 (18.0)	21 (35.0)	12 (22.6)	20 (36.4)	13 (18.6)	77 (25.8)
Application	0 (0)	1(1.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.4)	2 (0.7)
Analysis	7 (11.5)	3 (5.0)	3 (5.7)	3 (5.5)	4 (5.7)	20 (6.7)
Synthesis	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Evaluation	1 (1.6)	4 (6.7)	1 (1.9)	2 (3.6)	2 (2.9)	10 (3.3)
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>299(100)</b>

A, B, C, D & E - Teachers

The findings of the study indicated that 299 questions were collected from five Senior High School Social Studies teachers. Out of the 299 question, 190(63.5%) were at the recall level, 77(25.8%) were at the comprehension level, 10(3.3%) were at the evaluation level, 2(0.7) were at the application level, no question (0) was set at the synthesis level. This indicated that the levels of recall, comprehension and analysis were the ones tested. Emphasis was highly laid on measurement of recall ranging from 51.7% to 71.4%. More obvious is the fact that aspect of application, evaluation and synthesis were sparsely measured or not measured at all by those five teachers' (A, B, C, D, and E) whose exam papers were collected. This means that those five Social Studies teachers' questions emphasised the knowledge of recall and comprehension. The results generated are in agreement with those obtained by Dlamini and Dlamini (2005) and Ajiboye (2009) which indicated that, most high school teachers have the tendency of teaching and testing their students at lower levels of cognition; whereby the teachers teaching at the knowledge and comprehension levels and still expected that students will be able to solve problems at higher levels of cognition. The evaluation strategies for upper levels are more complex and sophisticated; as supported by Ajiboye (2009). It is therefore clear that the result run contrary to the postulations of the CRDD (2007; 2010) which stated that all the domains and levels of knowledge must be used for effective teaching, learning and assessment of social studies in Ghana.

### 5. Conclusions

Discrepancies exist between what teachers said they assessed and what they actually assessed in Social Studies. Test items addressed in the end of term examination in Social Studies were mainly those measuring cognitive outcomes. Within the cognitive domain, the only levels which were covered are knowledge of recall and a little bit of comprehension. More objective test questions were used than the essay type of questions. These results are a clear indication that the way students are tested in the Social Studies end of term examination are contrary to the main goals and objectives of the subject which is to develop a reflective, concerned, responsible and participatory citizen in the civic life of individuals in a country.

### 6. Recommendations

There is the need to plan and conduct effective professional development initiatives, including both pre-and in-service training, to transform teachers' epistemologies in line with the current theories of teaching, learning and assessment. Unless teachers' underlying assumptions are assessed and refocused, their instructional and assessment practices cannot be transformed.

Furthermore, the teacher training institutions or universities should try to infuse their Social Studies curricula with more value oriented, skills development and problem - solving content for pre-service teachers to equip Social Studies teachers to comprehensively emphasize the cognitive, affective and psychomotor components of its objectives in the classroom situation.

Moreover, Social Studies teachers should realize that the outcomes of classroom assessment and evaluation provide information about students' learning and give students a measure of their progress. There is therefore, the need to make appropriate educational decisions, and refocus students' learning to make it more efficient and effective. In addition, the continuous monitoring of students' learning will provide teachers with feedback about their effectiveness as teachers, and then the results of the assessment can be used to enhance teaching.

### References

Ajiboye, J. O. (2009). Beyond cognitive evaluation in primary social studies in Botswana: Issues and challenges. *European Journal for Social Sciences*, 7, 48-57

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *Taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook 1: cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.
- Bloom, B. S, Englaehart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, handbook 1: The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay
- Borich, G. D. (2004). *Effective teaching methods* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Pearson Merrill: Practice Hall.
- Caram, C. A., & Davis, P. B. (2005). Inviting student engagement with questioning. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 22(6), 19-23.
- Curriculum Research and Development Division (CRDD). (2007). *Social Studies teaching syllabus for Senior High Schools*. Accra: Ministry of Education.
- CRDD. (2010). *Social Studies teaching syllabus for Senior High Schools*. Accra: Ministry of Education.
- Croom, B., & Stair, K. (2005). Getting from q to a: effective questioning for effective learning. *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, 78, 12-14.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Dynneson, L. D., & Gross, R. E. (1999). *Designing effective instruction for secondary Social Studies*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ellis, A. K. (2002). *Teaching and learning elementary social studies*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Erinosho, S. Y., & Badru A. K. (2000). Classroom assessment and evaluation. In P. Obanya (Ed). *Teaching effectiveness in Nigerian schools*. Nigeria: Sam Bookman Publishers, Ibadan.
- Eshun, I. (2013). Appraisal of colleges of education social studies curriculum vis-à-vis the Junior High School (JHS) social studies curriculum implementation in Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(1), 12-18.
- Farrant, J. S. (1980). *Principles and practice of education*. London: Longman Group.
- Fisher, R. (1995). *Teaching children to think*. Cheltenham: Starney Thornes.
- Gephart, W. J., & Ingle, R. B. (1976). *Evaluation and the affective domain*. Proceedings of the National Symposium for Professors of Educational Research (NSPER).
- Grineski, S. (1993). Recreation and dance. *The Journal of Physical Education*. Vol. 64. Retrieved on July 04, 2012 from <http://www.questia.com/googleScholar.qts?docId>
- Guan Eng Ho, D. (2005). Why do teachers ask the questions they ask? *RELC*, 36(3), 297-310.
- Hattie, J., Biggs, J., & Purdie, N. (1996). Effects of learning skills interventions on student learning: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 99-136.
- Himsl, R., & Lambert, E. (1993). *Signs of learning in an affective domain*. Edmonton, CA: Alberta Department of Education.
- Kellough, R. D., & Kellough, N. G. (1999). *Secondary School teaching: A guide to methods and resources; planning for competence*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hill.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. New York: Longmans, Green.
- Krathwohl, D. R., & Bloom, B. S. (eds.) (1993). *Taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing*. New York: Longman.
- Kyriacou, C. (1995). *Effective teachings in schools: (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. London: Stanley Thomas Publications Ltd.
- Latham, A. (1997). Asking students the right questions. *Educational Leadership*, 54(6), 84-65
- Lynch, D. R., Russell, J. S., Evans, J. C., & Sutterer, K. G. (2009). Beyond the cognitive: The affective domain, values, and the achievement of the vision. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*, 135, 47-56.
- Main, R. (1992). *Integrating the affective domain into the instructional design process*. California State University, College of Communications. Brooks AFB, TX: Air Force Systems Command.
- Martin, B. L., & Briggs, L. J. (1986). *The cognitive and affective domains: Integration for instruction and research*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.
- Martin, B. L., & Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). Affective education and the affective domain: Implications for instructional-design. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed), *Instructional-design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory* (pp.485-510). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Martin, F. (2006). Ethnography: A future for primary geography and primary geography research? *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 14(4), 364-371.
- Miller, M. (2005). Teaching and learning in affective domain. In M. Orey (Ed.), *emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. Retrieved on August 11, 2012 from <http://projects.coe.uga.edu/epltt>.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1996). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for Social Studies*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

- National Council for the Social Studies.(2004). *Program standards for the initial preparation of social studies teachers*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Nitko, A. J., & Brookhart, S. M. (2001). *Educational assessment of students* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Obemeata, J. O. (1984). Non-cognitive assessment in educational evaluation. In P. Obanya (Ed). *Curriculum Theory and Practice*. Ibadan: Educational Research and Study Group.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Lasley, T. J. (2000). *Strategies for effective teaching* (3rd ed.). Boston, USA: McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Pierre, E., & Oughton, J. (2007). The affective domain: Undiscovered country. *College Quarterly*, 10(4), 21–28.
- Quartey, S. M. (1984). *Methods book for social studies* (1st Ed.). Lagos: Orit Egwa Ltd.
- Snow, R. (1989). Aptitude-treatment interaction as a framework for research on individual differences in learning. In P. Ackerman, R. Sternberg, & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Learning and individual differences*. New York, NY: Freeman
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Tan, Z. (2007). Questions in Chinese University EL Classrooms: What lies beyond it? *RELC*, 38 (1), 87-103.
- Vogler, K. E. (2005). Improve your verbal questioning. *The Clearing House*, 79 (2), 98-103.
- West African Examination Council (2007). *Chief examiner's report*. WAEC: Author