An Investigation of Assessment Practices by Teachers Business Education Subjects

Janet Adetayo

Academic Leadership Journal

An Investigation of Assessment Practices by Teachers Business Education Subjects

Issues: Summer 2008 - Volume 6 Issue 3

Posted On 2010-09-08 10:25:56

Author(s): Janet Adetayo

Introduction

Assessment is the process of gathering information about a student in order to make decisions about his or her education. Assessment is used for different purposes within different levels of the educational system, for example external assessment in most cases serve as accountability measures and as a result they induce teachers to devote significant amounts of instructional time to preparing students to excel in these examinations even when those examinations do not match the curricula.

However, the primary aim of assessment is to foster learning of worthwhile academic content for all students. Education reformers agree that assessment and instruction are two sides of a coin and that an invisible thread connects assessment, curriculum and teaching in the service of learning (Kathy, 2000). Unfortunately, when we think of assessment, we think of the traditional tests but Odetoyinbo (2004) citing Noori (1993) submitted that she is of contrary opinion when she stated that for years, tests have been designed to reflect the positivistic-quantitative paradigm and have been developed to ensure that children are learning the 'basics'.

The assessment practices employed by the teacher is equally important as the other aspects of curriculum such as objectives and instructional strategies to be employed especially when assessment strategies are employed as instructional tools rather than measurement tool but unfortunately the core curriculum is silent on this issue. Assessment is expected not only to take care of pupils' knowledge and comprehension but beyond that, evaluation of skills, growth in application, analysis, synthesis as well as development of positive attitude are important.

Teaching and learning are complementary activities, which are formally undertaken in a school context. Teaching describes the action of a teacher that helps pupils to acquire and retain knowledge, attitude and skills. Learning is associated with behavioural changes in the cognitive (mental processes), affective (attitudes and feelings) and Psychomotor (coordination between brain and muscles) domains (Farrant, 1980). One serious defect in the system of evaluation, which is now being changed, is that the measurement of pupil 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 pupils (Obemeata, 1984) whereas complete assessment must covers all the three domains of educational objectives. 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 Business education is very important because, according to Osuala (1998), Business education is a training system that encourages the beneficiary to acquire skills that fits into the world of work. Nwosu (1999) described Business Education as "education FOR and ABOUT business", it purpose according to him is to prepare individuals for gainful employment in business occupations. Whether paid-employment or self-employment, the emphasis is on exposure to, and acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes relevant and adequate for employment in specific business occupations.

Also, Nwaokolo (1992), stated that Business education encompasses knowledge, attitudes and skills needed by all citizens in order to effectively manage their personal business and economic system, and Aina (2002) citing Igew (2000), submitted that it is an embodiment of vocational knowledge and skills needed for entry-level into employment and advancement in a broad range of business careers. Therefore, for complete assessment of Business Education subjects (i.e. book-keeping/accounting, typewriting, shorthand, office practice, business studies, economics, commerce etc.) at the secondary level the three domains of educational objectives must be assessed.

Business education according to Eni (1987) "…includes education for office occupations, distribution and marketing occupations, accounting, business teaching, business administration and economic understanding". The foregoing point out that Business education covers a wide range of spectrum of economic life activities in any society, and also refers to the pedagogical and desirable business competencies necessary for self-employment or being employed with a view to making the recipient self-reliant. Thus, Business education can, through appropriate training, ensure for individual's full employment even in our present moral decadence economy by equipping them with life-long skills for self-employment and a wholesome assessment of learners will ensure this.

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). In other words, good classroom teaching and assessment depend on the explicitness of instructional objectives.

It is important, therefore, for the Business education 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). After the formulation of suitable instructional objectives, the next step should be the selection of appropriate method(s) for obtaining desired feedback on the extent to which those objectives are being achieved (Grayson, 1998).

Once it is established that it is important that wholistic assessment of all domains of educational objective should be assessed by the teachers vis-à-vis the cognitive, affective and psychomotor outcomes, the next step is for the teacher to devise situations and techniques, which will make it possible for pupils to manifest the desired affective and psychomotor behaviour, which he intends to

measure. One of the major differences between the assessment of cognitive outcomes and the affective and psychomotor outcomes is that while the assessment of cognitive outcomes is concerned with finding out what a person can do, the assessment of affective outcomes attempts to measure how a person feels while the assessment of psychomotor outcomes is concerned with skill acquisition.

It follows, therefore, that the instruments for measuring affective/psychomotor outcomes are different for those used for assessing cognitive outcomes. Various instruments exist for measuring affective and psychomotor outcomes and this ranges from self-report inventories, questionnaire, observation, anecdotal records, socio-metric techniques etc. However, the use of these assessments instrument depends on what the teacher is looking for. Moreover, the teacher will need to decide on the use for which the assessment information is needed, and then select reliable and comprehensive assessment technique that provides the desired feedback. It is from this background that this study wants to find out whether business education teachers assesses the complete domain of learning and the extent to which they uses the different assessment instruments.

Research Question:

In other to answers the identified problems, the following research questions were raised:

1. Do teachers assess the complete domain of learning in the classroom?

   1. What is the frequency of the usage of the assessment instruments by the business education teachers in the classroom situation?

Methodology

This study adopted a multi-stage sampling technique. The first stage was the stratification of the twenty local government areas in Ogun State to it four original region that is Egba, Ijebu, Yewa and Remo. The second stage is the random selection of a local government area from each region to give a total of three (3) local government areas. The third stage was the selection of 70% of secondary in each of the selected local government areas. The fourth and the last stage was the purposive selection of three (3) business education subjects teachers in the selected schools. In all one hundred and fifty teachers responded to the researcher developed and validated Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices Checklist (TECAPC).

The checklist was in two parts. The first part that consisted of ten (10) items of Yes/No response format was used to collect data on assessment of complete domain of behavioural objectives while the second part consisting of seventeen (17) items of frequently/occasionally/never response format was used to collect data on the frequency of usage of assessment instrument. The first draft of the checklist was given to experts in questionnaire design in the department of curriculum studies and instructional technology of Olabisi Onabanjo University for perusal. Later the final draft was trial tested on teachers who were not part of the sample for the study. A test-retest reliability co-efficient of 0.72 was obtained.

The frequencies of respondents to the items were pooled together and the responses were also converted to percentages to aid easy interpretation of results.

Results and Discussion

Research question 1: Do teachers assess the complete domain of learning in the classroom?

Table 1: Teachers' Assessment of Holistic Domains of Behavioural Objectives

Domain	Item No	Yes Percent. %	No Percent. %	Total Percent. %
Cognitive	1	132 88	18 12	150 100
	2	54 36	96 64	150 100
	3	109 73	41 27	150 100
Sub-total		98 65	52 35	150 100
Affective	4	21 14	129 86	150 100
	5	27 18	123 82	150 100
	6	11 00	150 100	150 100
	7	48 32	102 68	150 100
Sub-total		24 16	126 84	150 100
Psychomotor	8	30 20	120 80	150 100
	9	77 51	73 49	150 100
	10	55 37	95 63	150 100
Sub-total		54 36	96 64	150 100

The result in table 1 showed that 65% of the teachers said they do concentrate on the cognitive domain of behavioural objectives in their student achievement alone while 35% said that they do not concentrated on the assessment of the cognitive domain alone. Only 16% of the teachers indicated that they assessed the affective domain of behavioural objectives, while 84% of the respondents said no, they do not assess the affective domain. Also, 36% of the teachers agreed that the psychomotor domain is often given a paramount place in their assessment of student learning while 64% stated that they rarely bothered themselves with the assessment of the psychomotor domain. The trend showed that majority of the teachers does not assess the whole domains of behavioural objectives but they all concentrated on the cognitive domain at the expense of other domains. Hence, the teachers do not engage in holistic assessment of the students' achievement on the entire domain of behavioural objectives but concentrated on cognitive domain alone.

This finding is supported by the submission of Erinosho and Badru (2000) that the cognitive domain is the most relevant for school subjects and with which the teachers are often most comfortable to measure. This was also against the focus of Bloom (1956) in his taxonomy of educational objectives that was developed for cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains.

Research question 2: What is the frequency of the usage of the assessment instruments by the business education teachers in the classroom situation?

Table 2: Distribution of the Frequency of Usage of Business Education Subjects Assessment Instruments

Item No	Assessment Instrument	Frequently		Occasionally		Never		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Field Trip/ Exc.	04	03	57	38	89	59	150	100
5	Peer assessment	13	09	96	64	41	27	150	100
6	M. C. Question	105	70	23	15	22	15	150	100
8	C. A. Test	126	84	16	11	08	05	150	100
10	Essay Test	113	75	24	16	13	09	150	100
	Sub-total: Cognitive	72	48	43	29	35	23	150	100
7	Anecdotal Record	27	18	72	48	51	34	150	100
9	Unstructure Interview	22	15	60	40	68	45	150	100
11	Structured Interview	07	05	68	45	75	50	150	100
12	Questionnaire	07	05	30	20	113	75	150	100
13	Observation	21	14	61	41	68	45	150	100
14	Anecdotal. Record	33	22	105	70	12	08	150	100
15	Socio-metric Test	15	10	51	34	84	56	150	100
16		15	10	72	48	63	42	150	100
17		16	11	59	39	75	50	150	100

	Rating scale Anecdotal. Record								
	Sub-total: Affective	18	12	64	43	68	45	150	100
2	Operating. Equipmen	18	12	83	55	49	33	150	100
3	Practical Skill	34	23	68	45	48	32	150	100
4	Team design	27	18	78	52	45	30	150	100
	Sub-total: Psycho.	26	17	77	52	47	31	150	100

Table 2 revealed that of the listed assessment instruments for the three domain of behavioural objectives, that 48% of the teachers frequently use assessment instrument to measure the cognitive domain, 29% used the cognitive assessment instrument occasionally while 23% do not use them at all. It was further evident that 12% of the teachers frequently use assessment instruments to measure the affective domain, 43% used the affective assessment instrument occasionally while the 45% do not use them at all. But, in the usage of assessment instrument for measuring the psychomotor domain, 17% of the teachers used the assessment instruments frequently, 52% used them occasionally while 31% do not use the instruments at all. The implication of this findings is that majority of the teachers frequently use the assessment instruments in the cognitive domain without given serious attention to the usage of assessment instruments for measuring affective and psychomotor domains.

The finding of this study corroborated that of Obemeata (1984) who submitted that teachers do not given credence to the assessment of the affective and psychomotor domain of educational objectives because the assessment instruments for measuring them are either occasionally or never used. The use of these assessment tools, which have to be valid, reliable and in sufficient variety according to Emeke (1999) will help the learner to develop to the fullest of his potentials.

Recommendations and Conclusion

From the outcome of the study, it can be concluded business education subject teachers are not assessing the complete domain of behavioural objectives rather they resort to the assessment of the cognitive domain alone without paying attention to the assessment of the affective and the psychomotor domain.

As a result of the revelation from the study, it is recommended that the teachers need to be reminded of their primary function which is to facilitate learning and if this will be possible they have 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) because if objectives are formulated in all domains of learning it will not be difficult for the teachers to assess the students in the three domains. Teachers should also realize that the inclusion of affective and psychomotor assessment as distinctive features of assessment is a step at getting the truest possible picture of a learner.

As part of training process for the teacher, it should be inculcated in them that a carefully planned and implemented assessment technique will produce useful data that will help to answer those questions that were initially posed on students learning as well as students' personality and physical development. And they should realize also that the outcomes of classroom assessment and evaluation provide information about students' learning, give students a measure of their progress as learners in order to make appropriate educational decisions, and refocused students' learning to make it more efficient and effective. Furthermore, the continuous monitoring of students' learning will provides teachers with feedback about their effectiveness as teachers, and then the results of the assessment can be used to enhance teaching.

References

Abe, S.E. 2003. Business and Technical Education for Self-Reliance: A Recipe for Employability. Nigerian Association of Business Education. Vol. 1, 3: 58-66.

Aina, Olu 2002. Business Education, Technology and National Development (A keynote address), Business Education Journal. Vol. 3, 5.

Anyaduba, M.A. 1984. "Business Education and Society" Address at the inaugural meeting of the Nigeria Association of Business Educator at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, March 30th, 1984.

Bloom, B.S. 1956. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Emeke, E.A. 1999. Psychological Dimensions of Continuous Assessment Implementation on Teachers and Students in Secondary Schools in Oyo State. In Obemeata, J.O.; Ayodele, S.O. & Araromi M.A. (eds) Evaluation in Africa in Honour of E.A. Yoloye. Stirling-Horden Publishers (Nig.) Ltd.

Eni, C.O. 1987. "Business Education in a Developing Economy: The Nigerian Case". Business Education Journal, Vol. 11, 1

Erinosho, S.Y. & Badru A.K. 2000. Classroom Assessment and Evaluation, Teaching Effectiveness in Nigerian Schools. Sam Bookman Publishers, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Farrant, J.S. 1980. Principles and Practice of Education . London: Longman Group.

Grayson, H.W. 1998. Classroom Assessment Techniques. Teaching Resource Centre, the University of Tennessee.

Guilford, J.P. 1972. Psychometric methods (2nd edition) New York. McGraw-Hill.

Kathy, C. 2000. How do we assess learning in Integrated Science in Bachelor of Science in Education (B.Sc {Ed.}), Making sense of Integrated Science: A guide for high schools. Colorade Springs Co.

Krathwohl, D.R. et al 1956. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Lowman, 1990. "Promoting Motivation and Learning," College Teaching, 38,4, 136-139.

Nwakolo, P.O.E. 1992. "Educating the Business Teacher for self-reliance in a Decadent Economy: An Entrepreneurial Initiative." Business education Journal. Vol. 11, No 4.

Nwosu, B.O. 1999. Appraisal of information technology a strategy for achieving the mission of business education in the 21st century. Journal of Business education. 3, 2: 31-39.

Obemeata, J.O. 1984. Non-cognitive Assessment of Educational Evaluation. Educational Research and Study Group.

Odetoyinbo, B.B. 2004. Evaluation of the Nigerian Integrated Science Programme in Junior Secondary Schools in Oyo State. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Osuala, E.C. 1987. A handbook on Vocational and Technical Education for Nigeria. Urowulu-Obosi, Pacific publisher.

Osuala, E.C. 1998. Foundations of Vocational Education, Nigeria Meks Publishers Limted.

Taba H. 1962. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt Brace.

VN:R_U [1.9.11_1134]