INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND PHILOLOGY

DOI: https://doi.org//10.69648/ZPFW1810

International Journal of Education and Philology (IJEP), 2026; 7(1): 57-74.

ijep.ibupress.com

Online ISSN: 2671-3543

Application: 14.04.2026

Revision: 17.05.2026

Acceptance: 21.06.2026

Publication: 26.06.2026

Jimola, F. E., & Aborisade, O. J. (2026). Pre-service teachers' construction and utilization of the affective domain assessment techniques. International Journal of Education and Philology, 7(1), 57-74.

https://doi.org//10.69648/ZPFW1810

Folasade Esther Jimola, Olatunbosun James Aborisade

[1] Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0857-8355

[2] Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7361-2778

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Folasade Esther Jimola.

Email: folasade.jimola@eksu.edu.ng

BALKAN JOURNALS

Pre-Service Teachers' Construction and Utilization of The Affective Domain Assessment Techniques

Folasade Esther Jimola, Olatunbosun James Aborisade

Abstract

The tripartite taxonomies of learning, without exemptions, contribute in no small measure to students' learning outcomes. However, existing literature has not identified ongoing gaps in the utilization of affective assessment among pre- service teachers. The paper assesses pre-service teachers' construction and utilization of the affective domain assessment techniques in classrooms. Descriptive research of a survey type was employed to approach the research problem. The study employed simple random sampling technique. Quantitative research data were collected by administering a well-structured-close-ended questionnaire on sixty pre-service teachers from two universities in Ekiti State, Nigeria who had undergone two teaching practicums. Findings revealed that pre-service teachers hardly utilize the affective domain assessment techniques during teaching practicum. The mostly utilized techniques are questioning, performance assessment and observation, leaving out other assessment techniques. In addition, a significant portion of the respondents could neither construct teacher-made affective assessment techniques nor knowledgeable of how to make use of standardized tests in classroom. Also, majority of respondents only pay attention to students' attitude, attention and participation in class activities leaving out other numerous affective domain components. The study concluded that pre-service teachers' knowledge and utilization of the affective domain assessment techniques is not encouraging. The study recommended that at the teacher training programme, pre-service teachers should be taught the significance of the affective domain, how to construct and utilize affective assessment techniques in classroom.

Keywords: Affective domain, affective assessment techniques, construction, pre-service teachers, utilization

Introduction

Comprehensive learning and assessment are requisites phases of educational programmes. Kasilingam et al. (2014) expound that the target of Bloom's taxonomy is to generate an integrated form of education through the three learning domains: cognitive, psychomotor and affective. The cognitive domain is about how knowledge and intellectual capabilities are acquired and processed. Psychomotor has to do with carrying out manual or physical skills to a defined level of precision, smoothness, swiftness, or potency. The affective domain centers "*on attitude, motivation, willingness to participate, valuing what is being learned and ultimately incorporating the discipline values into real life*" (Kasilingam et al., 2014, p.28). These domains serve interdependent and complementary roles, and none should be less treated. However, students' performance in and reaction to school subjects hinge on affective taxonomy because it is a receptive and an underlying factor.

In spite the importance of the three domains in teaching-learning process, research revealed that of all the three domains, cognitive domain has received much concentrated attention to the detriment of affective domain which is a less trodden part. Kuboja (2016) concurred that the affective domain is the least applied, less understood and much more difficult to assess in schools. Teachers are more particular about learners' dexterity at the levels of the cognitive domain (Nkomo & Ojating, 2018; Moroaswi et al., 2023). Some factors are considered responsible for the neglect of the affective domain such as its learning outcomes, pedagogy and assessment. These areas are considered inconsequential because of the inclusion of some intrinsic qualities like beliefs, perceptions, values, motivation, and interests (Olatunji, 2013). Affective domain, at times, fluctuates which could be influenced by a person's mood. With the inclusion of intrinsic traits, transparency and authenticity of intrinsic qualities might not be ensured due to absence of validated standards. Fear of victimization could lead to insincerity on the part of the learners to their teachers' questions. Shakeel (2019) affirmed that one of the banes of students' inability to achieve their learning goals has been attributed to learners' passivity, lack of interest and loss of concentration power in classrooms. Kuboja and Ngussa (2015, p.38) decried the state of moral decadence in the society and linked it to downplay of the teaching of the affective domain in classroom.

Teaching practice also known as teaching practicum (TP) is part of the teacher education program organized to expose students to authentic teaching and learning situations from where they can practice what they have been taught in the university or college in real life situations. The experience garnered at this stage avails

pre-service teachers the opportunity to get conversant with pedagogy, school milieus, student-teacher interaction, and professional qualities and development. It is important that pre-service teachers become aware that the neglect of affective domain in classroom activities could lead to lack of interest in daily classroom tasks, lack of concentration power, anxiety generated by social phenomena, timidity, guilt, and inferiority complex. Several studies (Boyd et al., 2006; Kasilingam et al., 2014; Kuboja, 2016; Nkomo & Ojating, 2018; Moroaswi et al., 2023) have reiterated the neglect of the affective domain in classroom by teachers which could be occasioned by different factors such as teachers' inability to construct and utilize affective assessment techniques.

The study investigates pre-service teachers' knowledge of the overview of the components and levels of the affective domain, without singling out any of the components of the affective domain as the major focus. Thus, the present study sought to investigate the knowledge of pre-service teachers to construct and use the affective assessment techniques in teaching practicum, and investigate the affective domain components that pre-service teachers attend to in classroom. These areas have not been investigated in the literature understudied in the present paper. To this end, research questions were raised for the study:

1. Which of the affective domain components do pre-service teachers give attention to in classroom?
2. Can pre-service teachers construct affective assessment techniques that assess the affective domain?
3. What affective assessment techniques do pre-service teachers utilize in classrooms?
4. What is the pre-service teachers' perceived ease of assessing the levels of the affective domain in classroom?
5. What behavioral verbs do pre-service teachers employ to specify learning outcomes of the levels of the affective domain?

Literature Review

An outward expression that is controlled by emotions is referred to as an affect (Brett et al., 2018). Moroaswi et al. (2023, p.230) explained that "affect' has two components: inside and the between. The "inside" refers to personality attributions such as character, self-esteem, anxiety, temperaments, attitudes, motivation,

and learner styles. "Between" refers to the social and interpersonal learning processes that take place in the classroom, among students, and among teachers and students". Affective domain is evident in behaviors indicating attitudes, interest, emotions, attention, prejudice, appreciations, concerns, taste, responsibility, values, sentiments, and various forms of physiological or mental trials (Okoli et al., 2022; Annenberg Foundation, 2024). The affective domain is the aspect that embodies how learners feel, how they respond to their feelings and how they manage their emotions. Emotional state of learners often serves as driving force of behavior which exert influence on what they learn, how they learn, the decisions they make and interaction with the society. Learning can be enhanced if teachers are aware of students' interest, attitudes, self-esteem, emotions, and feelings towards the lesson.

Krathwohl et al. (as cited in Bostwick, 2000) affirmed that the affective domain has its characteristics, instructional objectives and behavioral verbs for specifying learning outcomes:

Table 1

(*Levels of the Affective Domain: Characteristics, Instructional Objectives and Behavioral Verbs*)

Levels	**Characteristics**	**Instructional Objectives**	**Behavioral Verbs**
Receiving	*Phenomena related with getting students' attention in class*	• *Listening attentively* • *Attending diligently to classroom tasks*	*Ask, give, choose, describe, identify, locate, name, point to, select, differentiate*
Responding	*Active involvement and reaction of students to phenomenon in class.*	• *Active engagement in class tasks* • *Show interest in subject*	*Comply, discuss, approve, answer, applaud, volunteer, assist, label, perform, recite*
Valuing	*Concerned with the importance a student attaches to a particular phenomenon*	• *Expression of concern for other's welfare* • *Exhibit problem-solving demeanour*	*Assist, defend, complete, demonstrate, differentiate, initiate, justify, propose, share, support*

Levels	**Characteristics**	**Instructional Objectives**	**Behavioral Verbs**
Organization	*Concerned with the development of a value by arranging the value in order of priority.*	• Acknowledge systematic planning in solving issues • Appropriately timing to meet with diverse needs	Adhere, Accommodate, arrange, combine, compare,, formulate, integrate, modify, synthesize, discriminate
Characterization	Individual possesses a value system that dictates their behavior which is predictable and consistent.	• Work in groups, independently • Dispassionate approach in solving problem	Verify, revise, resolve, act, discriminate, display, influence, modify, perform, practice, qualify

Adapted from Krathwohl et al. (1964, as cited in Bostwick, 2000).

Neuman and Friedman (as cited in Allen and Friedman, 2010) observed some lapses in Krathwohl et al. (1964)'s taxonomy of the affective domain. They claim that Krathwohl et al. (1964)'s taxonomy is limited in its usefulness for designing instruction, specifically, its inability to make distinctions between the learner's attitudes about the learning experience and actual affective learning. Hence, they proposed taxonomy of affective learning. The taxonomy starts with identification, clarification, exploration, modification, and characterization. Learners are taught identification when they are able to differentiate peoples' thoughts, evidence, feelings, notions, and understand the peculiarity of their own personal views, assumptions, values, beliefs, and attitude when compared with others. Clarification of values means that learners ought to have liberty to select perceived values from available options, internalize the values, weigh and affirm the selected choice, express and act upon the preferred values, and act regularly with the preferred choice. Exploration, which is the third level, implies that learners examine the consequences and shortcomings of their choice and they compare and contrast them with other's viewpoints. Modification, the fourth level, occurs when learners adjust, assimilate certain values, attitudes, or beliefs, or alter to accommodate the available options in a receptive manner. The final level which is characterization means that learners have good understanding of their views, assumptions, values, beliefs, and attitude, and have imbibed and systemized them into an orderly structure which now defines and depicts learners. The degree of absorption of values is reflected in the consistency of learners' behavior and maturity (Allen & Friedman, 2010).

Studies on the Affective Domain and its Utilization

Different studies have been carried out on taxonomy of affective domain. Respondents in Griffith and Nguyen (2006) gave clues to the trends in public schools and entry knowledge of just recruited teacher. They noted that many teachers tailored teaching and learning tasks in the class towards acquisition of minimum levels of academic skills, to the extent that teachers did not allocate time to address the affective domain. The respondents, who were just recruited into the teaching profession, felt they possess the knowledge to teach the affective domain, yet most of them did not make the time to teach the affective skills. Aydın et al. (2009) investigated the views of English language teachers on the affective domain in language classroom. The participants acknowledged the significance of the affective aspect to language learning, but the study did not capture whether the participants apply the affective skills in the classroom. Adetayo (2014) worked on how affective behavior can be assessed in learners. The study concluded that assessment of learners' affective behaviors aid learners' acquisition of academic competencies and psychomotor domain.

Nkomo and Ojating (2018) examined the extent to which the three domains of learning are assessed by academics in continuous assessments. It was discovered that out of the three domains, cognitive and psychomotor were adequately covered and one of the reasons given was that the university was a University of Technology, where most learning activities revolve around cognitive and psychomotor behaviors. Results in Charismana et al. (2023) results indicated that teachers have accurate knowledge of the affective domain. Nevertheless, teachers' refusal to construct affective domain assessment strategies and time limitations pose as constraints. In addition, the assessment of affective domain is considered relevant to teachers of Guidance and Counseling, Religious Education and Pancasila and Civics Education. Coffman and Kittur (2024) examined undergraduate engineering students' understanding and perceptions of affective domain of learning. It was shown in the study that there was a reduction in learners' interest, engagement and feelings when teachers failed to apportion learning tasks evenly, prioritize participatory classroom and utilize effective communication delivery.

The literature reviewed in this study focused on different aspects of the affective domain. These studies attest that the affective domain in learning could significantly influence and predict learning outcomes. These studies have recorded divergent findings. Nonetheless, it was discovered that none of these studies specifically assessed pre-service teachers' construction and utilization of affective assessment

techniques during teaching practice. Also, from the reviewed studies, none has focused on pre-service teachers' engagement with the levels of the affective domain. The reviewed papers have not examined perceived ease of assessing the affective domain and use of behavioral verbs for measuring learning outcomes of the affective domain. To bridge the research gap, the present study understudied each of the uncovered areas.

Methodology

Descriptive research design of a survey type was employed for this study. This design was employed because it gives room for gathering information on the existing situation and describes the situation according to the information supplied by the respondents.

Participants

Through the use of simple random sampling technique, 60 pre-service teachers were selected, 30 pre-service teachers who were in 400 level, finalists, in each of the two universities in Ekiti State, Nigeria participated in the study. This level was purposely selected because the pre-service teachers had undergone two different teaching practicums, and it is believed that they must have gathered a considerable knowledge of teaching experience. The ages of the respondents ranged from 19 to 25. Fifty-five percent of the respondents were female, while forty-five percent were male. The researchers sought the consent of the respondents, and the purpose of the study was made known to them. Respondents with affirmative responses were selected as sample for the study. There was strict adherence to research ethics. The identities of the respondents were guaranteed, their confidentiality was assured, and their particulars were not disclosed under any pretext.

Instruments and Procedure

A checklist and a self-structured questionnaire titled "Pre-service Teachers and the Affective Domain in Classrooms" were used for data collection. The questionnaire had four sections. Section A elicited demographic information of the respondents: age and gender. Section B focused on pre-service teachers' ability to construct teacher-made affective assessment techniques and pre-service teachers' usage of affective assessment techniques in classrooms. In these parts, respondents ticked either 'yes or no' for the construction of teacher-made techniques, and chose 'never', 'sometimes' and 'always' as applicable to the types of affective teaching

techniques employed classrooms. Section C centered on perceived ease of teaching and assessing affective domain in classrooms. This part was measured using Very Easy, Easy, Not Easy, Not Very Easy format. Section D focused on behavioral verbs that pre-service teachers' use in specifying learning outcomes of the affective domain. Respondents ticked these behavioral verbs by choosing either 'yes' or 'no' as applicable. The checklist had one section. It focused on how pre-service teachers give attention to the dimensions of the affective domain in classrooms. This part was measured using Always, Sometimes, Seldom, and Never. The levels of the affective domain discussed in this paper are based on Krathwohl et al. (1964)'s taxonomy.

Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

The researchers defined the content being measured, developed a draft questionnaire then, sought experts' opinions for the assessment of the content. Experts in language education, guidance and counseling, and testing, measurement and evaluation (T.M.E) ascertained the face and content validity of the instrument. A pilot study was conducted 20 pre-service teachers who were not part of the study. Also, reliability of the instrument was conducted and ascertained. Through a test-retest method using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation, the reliability of the instrument was estimated and a reliability coefficient of 0.78 was obtained. The final draft of the instrument was adjudged valid and reliable for the study after thorough scrutiny of the instrument was carried out. The data obtained were analyzed using frequency counts and percentages.

Results and Discussion

The results of data analyses for pre-service teachers' use of affective assessment tools in classrooms, perceived ease of teaching and assessing the levels of the affective domain in classroom and pre-service teachers' use of behavioral verbs for specifying learning outcomes of the levels of the affective domain as follows:

Table 2.

Components of the affective domain

S/N	As a pre-service teacher, which of the following do you give attention to during classroom instruction:	Always	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
1	Attitudes	53 (88.3%)	4 (6.7%)	2 (3.3%)	1 (1.7%)
2	Values	10 (16.7%)	8 (13.3%)	16 (26.7%)	26 (43.3)
3	Morals and ethics	6 (10%)	3 (5%)	21 (35%)	30 (50%)
4	Interest	12 (20%)	18 (30%)	16 (26.7%)	14 (23.3%)
5	Attention	57 (95%)	2 (3.3%)	1 (1.7%)	0 (0%)
6	Motivation	8 (13.3%)	2 (3.3%)	13 (21.7%)	37 (61.7%)
7	Sense of responsibility	2 (3.3%)	7 (11.7%)	7 (11.7%)	44 (73.3%)
8	Participation in class activities	54(90%)	5(8.3%)	1(1.7%)	-
9	Emotions	9(15%)	9(15%)	17(28.3%)	25(41.7%)

Source: Field Survey, 2026

Findings from Table 2 reveal unsatisfactory practices of the pre-service teachers on the affective domain in classroom delivery. This is evident in their responses to various practices they carry out in classroom. Apart from attitude, attention and participation in classroom activities, pre-service teachers rarely paid attention to motivation, emotions, values, morals and ethics, and sense of responsibility during classroom instruction. It can be inferred that pre-service teachers probably attached importance to students' attitude, attention and involvement in classroom activities in the learning process because these indices often visibly influence classroom dynamics, effective learning and learning outcomes. They regarded them as sine qua non for meaningful engagement, interaction and comprehension in classroom delivery. However, half of the respondents recognized the importance of students' interest in classroom, while the other half did not. The reason for this could be that pre-service teachers might consider balancing the diverse interests of students equally as a challenge. On the other hand, pre-service teachers did not consider emotions, values, morals and ethics as important, or, probably, they might consider it a challenge in addressing them within limited instructional time. This suggests that pre-service teachers seemed to consider topics in the curriculum as priorities, and might hold the view that emotions, values, morals and ethics are not vividly captured in their disciplines, curriculum and would not be evaluated in

examinations. Pre-service teachers opined that they hardly ever give attention to how students are motivated to partake in classroom tasks, nor imbibe willingness in the learners to take up responsibilities in the course of instructional practices.

These findings are corroborated by Okoli et al (2022) that students receive less attention in the area of the affective domain from their teachers. Eshun (2013) investigated Social Studies teachers' questions emphasis in senior high schools in Ghana. Findings revealed that the examination questions set by teachers were skewed. 299 questions were set, all the questions assessed cognitive domain, while no question was set on affective and psychomotor domains. Rimland (2013) observed that respondents shy away from the affective domain because affective learning outcomes are not immediate but represent long-term internalized value. The study condemned teachers' insouciant attitude to the affective domain in schools, and affirmed that affective domain assists teachers to help students who have lost all hopes and have stopped believing in themselves to keep hope alive and be motivated to sustain their interest in teaching-learning process in classrooms. The findings of Olatunji (2013), Kasilingam et al. (2014) and Nande et al. (2013) support the findings of this present study that the peculiarity of the subjectivity of the affective domain in terms of teaching methods and assessment make it difficult for teachers to harness its potentialities. In addition, large class size constitutes problem to teaching and assessing of the affective domain in classroom. Furthermore, premium is on cognitive domain because it is emphasized in curricula and it is always assessed in examination with a focus on acquisition of knowledge and intellectual skills, and not intrinsic qualities (Shephard, 2008).

Table 3.

Pre-service teachers' construction and utilization of affective assessment techniques

S/N	Item	Yes	No
1	I plan my lesson to incorporate the affective domain learning objectives	12 (20%)	48 (80%)
2	It is important to construct affective assessment techniques	30(50%)	30(50%)
3	Can you construct assessment techniques that assess affective domain in classroom?	14 (23.3%)	46 (76.7%)
4	Can you make use of standardized test in measuring affective domain?	16 (26.7%)	44 (73.3%)
5	I find it simple to assess students' attitude.	22 (36.7%)	38 (63.3%)
6	I find it easy to assess students' interest.	15 (25%)	45 (75%)

7	On my own, I find it easy to assess students' emotions.		13 (21.7%)	47 (78.3%)
8	I am capable to assess values, morals and ethics in students.		8(13.3%)	52(86.7%)
9	I can assess students' attentiveness in classroom.		35 (58.3%)	25 (41.7%)
10	I can assess students' participation		57(95%)	3(5%)
11	Students' sense of responsibility is one the affective domain indices I can assess in classroom		22(36.7%)	38(63.3%)
12	I can easily assess students' level of motivation		15(25%)	45(75%)
13	It is important to assess students' affective domain in classroom		30(50%)	30(50%)
	Affective assessment techniques			
	How often do you utilize the following assessment techniques?	Never	Occasionally	Always
1	Questionnaires	55(91.7%)	5(8.3%)	-
2	Written reflections/journaling	51(85%)	9(15%)	-
3	Anecdotal records	53(88.3%)	7(11.7%)	-
4	Rating Scale	51(85%)	7(11.7%)	2(3.3%)
5	Checklists	43(71.7%)	12(20%)	5(8.3%)
6	Observation	2(3.3%)	3(5%)	55(91.7%)
7	Questioning	-	-	100(100%)
8	Interview Schedule	36(60%)	24(40%)	-
9	Performance Assessment	7(11.7%)	18(30%)	35(58.3%)
10	Portfolio Assessment	56(93.3%)	3(5%)	1(1.7%)

Source: Field Survey, 2026

Findings from Table 3 reveal that half of the respondents expressed certainty and the other half exuded uncertainty about the importance of constructing affective assessment techniques and assessing the domain in classroom. The study also shows that a considerable portion of the respondents never planned their lesson to integrate the affective domain learning objectives. Most of the pre-service teachers did not assess attitude, interests, emotions, sense of responsibility, motivation, and values, morals and ethics, except students' attentiveness and participation. The probable reasons for these shortcomings could be that re-service teachers are more familiar with cognitive learning objectives than affective objectives. The result likely occurred because affective traits like feelings, attitudes, and values are difficult to measure accurately. Participation and attentiveness were easier to assess because these behaviors are visible in the classroom, making them easier for teachers to observe and assess directly. Also, values, morals, emotions, and motivation were difficult to assess because these behaviors are personal and hidden, so teachers may not feel confident assessing them.

The findings of this study show that only a few number of pre-service teachers employed affective assessment techniques. The few techniques employed are questioning, performance assessment and observation, while majority of the respondents did not make use of questionnaires, interview schedule, anecdotal records, rating scale, checklists, written reflections/journaling, and portfolio assessment. The findings came this way because these are the easiest and most common classroom assessment methods teachers already know. Techniques like portfolios, journals, and questionnaires may require more time, skill, and training, which many pre-service teachers may not have. Findings in the study of Boyd et al. (2006) support the findings of the present study that the assessment of the affective domain is limited to the use of descriptive reflection, while Oakland (1997) explained that affective qualities cannot be measured directly because human attitude, emotions, feelings, value, and temperament are unstable qualities that are susceptible to change overtime and as circumstances lend itself. Many of the techniques employed in assessing affective qualities may not give either standardized conditions or direct observations because they are uncalibrated, they may lack standard, and may assess unverified constructs. Few of the assessment techniques employed in the study were checklist, questionnaire, survey, interview, naturalistic inquiry, sociometric methods, case study, and standardized and unstandardized self-report.

Also, the study of Jimola (2019) corroborates this finding that teachers seem not to be skilled on the various affective assessment techniques. Their knowledge of assessment tools for the affective domain is confined to the traditional assessment techniques of questioning and observation. Charismana et al. (2023) reported that teachers have correct knowledge of the affective domain, but they refused to construct affective domain assessment strategies due to time constraints. Contrarily, Okoli et al. (2022) affirmed that teachers are capable of constructing teacher-made test for measuring affective behavior, and also make use of standard test in measuring affective domain.

Table 4.

Pre-service teachers' perceived ease of assessing the levels of the affective domain

Levels of the affective domain:	**Very Easy**	**Easy**	**Not Easy**	**Not Very Easy**
I make students attend closely to classroom activities by listening attentively (receiving)	20 (33.3%)	30 (50%)	6 (10%)	4 (6.7%)
I make students develop interest in my subject by making sure they complete assigned homework (responding)	25 (41.7%)	15 (25%)	12 (20%)	8 (13.3%)
I make students show commitment in my class by allowing them to demonstrate problem solving attitude (valuing)	6 (10%)	10(16.7%)	26 (43.3%)	18 (30%)
I make students accept responsibility for their own actions in the course of solving problems (organization)	3 (5%)	6 (10%)	23 (38.3%)	28 (46.7%)
I teach team work by allowing students practice in group activities (characterization)	4 (6.7%)	12 (20%)	20 (33.3%)	24 (40%)

Behavioral verbs for specifying learning outcomes of the levels of the affective domain				
1	2	3	4	5
Receiving	**Responding**	**Valuing**	**Organization**	**Characterization**
Identify 55(91.7%)	Comply 2(3.33%)	Complete 13(21.7%)	Arrange 2(3.33%)	Solve 17(28.3%)
Locate 40(66.7%)	Discuss 42(70%)	Differentiate 25(41.7%)	Compare 27(45%)	Interpret 2(3.33%)
Select 20(33.3%)	Answer 35(58.3%)	Debate 12(20%)	Integrate 1(1.7%)	Act 3(5%)
Name 30(50%)	Perform 25(41.7%)	Justify 15(25%)	Demonstrate 32(53.3%)	Display 1(1.7%)
Listen 25(41.7%)	Practice 10(16.7%)	Support 1(1.7%)	Relate 5(8.3%)	Change 4(6.7%)
Choose 3(5%)	Volunteer 7(11.7%)	Initiate 1(1.7%)	Examine 9(15%)	Question 5(8.3%)

Source: Field Survey, 2026

Table 4 revealed that the majority of the respondents perceived that receiving and responding, which are the lower levels of affective domain, are assessable, but they considered valuing, organization and characterization as difficult levels. Besides, the results revealed that pre-service teachers made use of limited behavioral verbs for specifying learning outcomes in affective domain. Result showed that the respondents have the knowledge of the appropriate measurable behavioral verbs to assess the first and second levels of affective domain, but have limited knowledge of the appropriate measurable behavioral verbs for the third, fourth and fifth levels. Plausible reasons for the outcomes could be that receiving and responding were easier because they involve simple observable behaviors like listening and answering questions. Valuing, organization, and characterization involve deep personal behavior and long-term attitude change, which are difficult to observe and assess. Furthermore, pre-service teachers used few behavioral verbs because many pre-service teachers might have limited knowledge of affective-domain instructional terms and objectives. Also, words connected to simple classroom actions are more familiar to the pre-service teachers than verbs linked to advanced affective behaviors. In essence, schools and curricula often focus more on cognitive learning than affective learning, so pre-service teachers pay less attention to affective assessment.

Nande et al. (2013, p. 7) agreed with this finding and noted that both primary and secondary school curricula do not consider affective learning goals as paramount; they do not state affective instructional objectives in lesson plans. Consequently, textbook writers neglect affective objectives or components. More so, Muhammad et al. (2018) concurred that although teachers use diverse classroom assessment strategies in their classroom, yet they seem not to know its purposes. Findings of Appau et al. (2022) contravened the findings of the present study. Participants in the study carried out by Appau et al. (2022) had some degree of the knowledge of the principles of constructing affective test items and were knowledgeable of setting behavioral objectives of the affective domain.

The current discussion situates findings within existing literature but would benefit from more explicit articulation of how this study extends previous research contributions. While the study confirms patterns documented by scholars such as Eshun (2013) and Okoli et al. (2022) regarding neglect of affective assessment, it uniquely reveals the specific gap between pre-service teachers' recognition of certain affective components (attitude, attention, participation) and their systematic avoidance of others (emotions, values, morals). This distinction advances understanding beyond general observations of the affective domain neglect by identifying which

specific components receive attention and which remain marginalized, offering a more detailed picture of pre-service teacher preparation gaps. In addition, the finding that pre-service teachers possess knowledge of behavioral verbs for lower-level affective objectives but lack competence at higher levels extends the work of Nande et al. (2013) by pinpointing precisely where knowledge deficits exist along Krathwohl's taxonomy. The discussion would strengthen significantly by explicitly stating these unique contributions and clarifying how they build upon, rather than merely corroborate, existing scholarship.

Conclusion

The affective domain is pivotal to academic, social, moral, intellectual growth and development of students and by extension, the society in general. The study reveals the unsatisfactory practices of the pre-service teachers on the affective domain in classroom delivery. The study shows that there is a significant gap between pre-service teachers' knowledge of the affective domain and its application in classrooms. Hence, there is need for further training of pre-service teachers on the affective domain, especially the ones with abstract or long-term qualities such as attitude, interest, motivation, sense of responsibilities, and values, morals and ethics.

Limitations and Pedagogical Implications

The study is a descriptive study and the number of respondents (60) in the study was small hence, makes the study less representative and the findings cannot be generalized at the national level. Further studies can toe the line of quasi-experimental research with a sizeable number of respondents. The study investigated whether the respondents could construct affective assessment techniques and assess the domain. The study did not cover reasons why the respondents could not construct the affective assessment techniques and assess the domain. Further studies could be done along this line. Nonetheless, these constraints have not affected the results of this study rather this study has contributed to literature on pre-service teachers' and affective domain in classrooms. This study shows areas of strength and weaknesses of pre-service teachers' use of the assessment techniques of the affective domain.

Students, teachers and schools could benefit from the research findings. Students might get motivated because they will realize that emotions are important factors in classroom lessons. Teachers would be informed of the various indices of the affective assessment and assessment tools that can assess emotional needs of

students. Schools would have insight into various assessment tools that teachers can use for the affective domain, and could be properly monitored. The study would help researchers who wish to work on the affective domain.

The implication of the study requires substantial development to translate findings into actionable recommendations for educational practice and systemic change. Teacher education programs should integrate explicit training modules on constructing and implementing diverse affective assessment techniques beyond observation and questioning, including structured approaches to rating scales, reflective journaling protocols, and portfolio assessment frameworks that accommodate large class sizes. Curriculum developers must embed affective learning objectives explicitly within disciplinary content and examination frameworks to signal their legitimacy and importance, while assessment policies should mandate inclusion of affective domain evaluation in teacher performance reviews to institutionalize accountability. These findings carry broader implications for educational equity and social development, as systematic neglect of values, ethics, emotions, and responsibility perpetuates an education system that privileges cognitive knowledge transmission over character formation and civic development. Addressing these gaps through comprehensive teacher preparation reform and policy mandates could foster more holistic education that prepares learners not merely as knowledge repositories but as ethically grounded, emotionally intelligent, and socially responsible citizens capable of contributing meaningfully to democratic society and sustainable development.

Recommendations

The study recommended that:

- at the teacher training programme, pre-service teachers should be taught how to construct affective assessment techniques.
- during practicum, periodic check on pre-service teachers' utilization of affective assessment techniques should be carried out by pre-service teachers' supervisors and class teachers.
- pre-service teachers themselves should cultivate positive disposition to the construction and utilization of affective assessment techniques.
- holistic education through the integration of strategies that address affective domain should be emphasized during teacher training programs.

References

Adetayo, J. O. (2014). Assessing the affective behaviours in learners. *Journal of Education and Practice, 5*(16), 8–15.

Allen, K. N., & Friedman, B. D. (2010). Affective learning: A taxonomy for teaching social work values. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 7*(2), 1–12. https://jswve.org/volume-07/issue-2/

Annenberg Foundation. (2004). *Insights into Algebra 1: Teaching for learning – Teaching strategies: Affective domain*. Annenberg Learner. https://www.learner.org/series/insights-into-algebra-1-teaching-for-learning-2/exponential-functions/teaching-strategies-affective-domain/

Appau, B. K., Andoh, S., Adjei, E. K., Boateng, G., Fynn, S., & Osman, S. (2022). Teachers' knowledge in integrating affective domain in teaching and learning of Social Studies. *Universal Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2*(2), 85–92. https://doi.org/10.31586/ujssh.2022.337

Aydın, B., Bayram, F., Canıdar, B., Çetin, G., Ergünay, O., Özdem, Z., & Tunç, B. (2009). Views of English language teachers on the affective domain of language teaching in Turkey. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences, 9*(1), 263–280.

Bostwick, W. D. (2000). The need to establish an affective domain assessment strategy for your program. *Proceedings of the American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference*. https://peer.asee.org/the-need-to-establish-an-affective-domain-assessment-strategy-for-your-program.pdf

Boyd, B. L., Dooley, K. E., & Felton, S. (2006). Measuring learning in the affective domain using reflective writing about a virtual international agriculture experience. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 47*(3), 24–32. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2006.03024

Brett, A. M., Smith, M. L., & Huitt, W. G. (2018). Overview of the affective domain. In W. G. Huitt (Ed.), *Becoming a brilliant star: Twelve core ideas supporting holistic education* (pp. 83–104). IngramSpark. http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/2018-05-brett-etal--brilliant-star-affect.pdf

Charismana, D. S., Ratri, S. Y., & Firmansyah, F. (2023). A portrait of affective assessment implementation in junior high schools: Assessing its ideality. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan, 20*(2), 248–256. https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v20i2.61970

Coffman, A. L., & Kittur, J. (2024, June). *Investigating undergraduate engineering students' understanding and perceptions of affective domain of learning*. Paper presented at the 2024 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, Portland, OR, United States.

Eshun, I. (2013). Domain of educational objectives: Social Studies teachers' questions emphasise in senior high schools in Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice, 4*(4), 185–196. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/4539

Griffith, K. G., & Nguyen, A. D. (2006). Are educators prepared to affect the affective domain? *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal, 16*(3), 1–4.

Jimola, F. E. (2019). *Teachers' pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge and teaching styles as predictors of students' learning outcomes in Literature-in-English in Ekiti State, Nigeria* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ekiti State University, Nigeria.

Kasilingam, G., Ramalingam, M., & Chinnavan, E. (2014). Assessment of learning domains to improve student's learning in higher education. *Journal of Young Pharmacists, 6*(4), 27–33. https://doi.org/10.5530/jyp.2014.1.5

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective domain*. David McKay Company.

Kuboja, J. M., & Ngussa, B. M. (2015). Affective learning and cognitive skills improvement: Experience of selected schools in Arusha, Tanzania. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 4*(2), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v4-i2/1727

Kuboja, K. M. (2016). *Teachers' assessment of the integration of affective domain in community-based secondary schools in Tanzania: Toward holistic learning*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318216970_TEACHERS%27ASSESSMENT_OF_THE_INTEGRATION_OF_EFFECTIVE_DOMAIN_IN_COMMUNITY-BASED_SECONDARY_SCHOOLS_IN_TANZANIA_TOWARD_HOLISTIC_LEARNING

Moroaswi, O. M., Segabutla, M. H., Olifant, F. M., Cekiso, M. P., & Dieperink, M. (2023). Investigating students' self-perceived affective learning during classroom interaction involvement at a South African university. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 37*(4), 225–247. https://doi.org/10.20853/37-4-5061

Muhammad, S., Tahir, H., & Latif, I. (2018). Teachers' perceptions about the use of classroom assessment techniques in elementary and secondary schools. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 40*(1), 115–130.

Nande, B. K., Aboho, D. A., & Maduewesi, B. U. (2013). Affective domain: neglected area of learning objectives in Nigeria's primary and secondary schools. *World Educators Forum*, 1, 1–13. https://www.globalacademicgroup.com/journals/world%20educators%20forum/AFFECTIVE%20DOMAIN%20NEGLECTED%20AREA%20OF%20LEARNING%20OBJECTIVES%20IN%20NI.pdf

Nkomo, N., & Ojating, H. (2018). Effective coverage of learning domains in students' assessment by lecturers of Cross River University of Technology Calabar, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education, 6*(4), 23–29. https://doi.org/10.5121/ije.2018.6403

Oakland, T. (1997). Affective assessment. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional, 1*(2–3), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-85571997000100002

Okoli, P. C., Nwobi, E. U., Nnajiofor, H. U., Udogu, C. P., Agba, C. N., Agu, G. U., & Ezeanolue, A. O. (2022). A study on teachers' perception and awareness of the development of affective domain on teaching and learning in secondary schools. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, 9*(4), 907–921. https://ijrar.org/papers/IJRAR22D2386.pdf

Olatunji, M. O. (2013). Teaching and assessing of affective characteristics: A critical missing link in online education. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, 4*(1), 96–107.

Rimland, E. (2013). Assessing affective learning using a student response system. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 13*(4), 385–401. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2013.0037

Shakeel, S. (2019). The influence of affective domain on the learning of students at primary level. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3756396

Shephard, K. (2008). Higher education for sustainability: Seeking affective learning outcomes. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 9*(1), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.1108/14676370810842201