AFRICAN JOURNAL OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT (AJTPEA)
Hard Print ISSN: 2545-5834
e-Print ISSN: 2992-362X
VOL. 13, JUNE, 2024

THE PRACTICE OF CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOLS IN UYO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF AKWA IBOM STATE

[1]Emaeyak E. Ekong Ph.D (emaeyakekong@uniuyo.edu.ng**); [1]Roseline E. D. Ekim Ph.D(** roseline2014godwinhf@gmail.com**) & [2]Anthony I. Ekpeyong (**tyobongpadua@gmail.com**)**

[1]Department of Psychological Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Uyo.
[2]Department of Business Education, Faculty of Vocational and Library Science Education

Abstract

The study is a critical assessment of how continuous assessment is carried out in teachers' cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of learning in public secondary schools in Uyo Local Government of Akwa Ibom State. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The sample size of 120 teachers was drawn from the fourteen public secondary schools in Uyo Educational Committee using simple random sampling technique. The researcher randomly selected eight (8) public secondary schools in the Uyo Local Educational Committee, and 15 teachers were also randomly selected in each school. A self-structured "Teacher's Techniques of Continuous Assessment Questionnaire" (TTCAQ) was used to capture data. It had an overall reliability coefficient of .88, measuring the internal consistency of all the items in the instrument. Based on the study's findings, some recommendations were made, among which is that head teachers of post-primary schools and Education monitoring teams should place more emphasis and ensure that secondary school teachers adequately cover the three behavioural domains of learning in their continuous assessment in public secondary schools.

Introduction

Continuous assessment is a veritable tool in evaluating learning outcomes in any educational system; it helps the teacher determine at any point in the instructional process the extent to which learners crabs what they are expected to know in line with the behavioral objective or curriculum. This assessment approach helps the teachers, the students, and even parents to be well abreast with what is happening in the learning process (es). It also helps to dose off examination anxiety, allows teachers to evaluate students at intervals to determine the level of progress, diagnoses students with learning difficulties, cheating, and the rate of failure because students have more than just one chance to be examined by the teacher(s).

Being a regular evaluation process, it dispels the nonchalant attitude of some unserious students toward their studies. This means that both the teachers and students utilise this measure to evaluate themselves. Akpan and Ikechukwu (2018) defined continuous assessment as a holistic process that comprehensively assesses students' academic ability throughout the academic period in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of learning. This implies that for continuous assessment to be efficient and the scores reliable enough for holistic decision-

making, it must cover the three domains of learning, not just the cognitive domain of learning as it is obtainable in most public secondary schools in Nigeria.

Agi and Oyeti (2021) defined continuous assessment as an educational skill and technique used by teachers to frequently check and examine learners' competencies and abilities, which is recorded appropriately in numerical values to ascertain learners' positions in relation to other class members. They went further to describe continuous assessment as a systematic and unbiased process of using special appraisal techniques and tools to ascertain students' performance level over time to find out their level of academic competence. This, therefore, means that continuous assessment involves laying down procedures that must be followed by the teachers to arrive at a valid and reliable instrument that will enable the teacher(s) to make not just informed decisions but comprehensive ones. However, continuous assessment can be described as a series of academic tasks given to learners periodically in the various domains of learning, depending on the curriculum to determine the extent of progress after the learners must have been exposed to a programme of instruction.

Continuous assessment takes various forms as determined by schools' management terms, and it is administered daily, weekly, monthly, or even twice or thrice a term. Continuous assessment takes different forms. It helps to determine the level of performance of individual students in a particular class as well as the overall performance of the students in the school. This aforementioned dictum corroborates with the assertion of Ipaye in Okwuba (2018) that continuous assessment is a comprehensive process of determining the overall achievements of each learner in areas of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains through evaluation tools and techniques like tests, observational techniques, projects, practical sessions, homework, interviews, etc. Continuous assessment gives teachers the window to determine the level of a child's understanding and also the responsibility of communicating students' academic development accurately based on evidence obtained from a variety of learning activities either at intervals or at the end of a programme of instruction. If an assessment is carried out while the programme is on-going, this aspect of assessment is regarded as an assessment of learning.

Assessment of learning is the assessment that parents, schools, students and even the general public derives information about the learning process and progress of a child. It is used to make critical and decisive decisions about the child's academic future. Assessments of learning are basically administered at the end of the academic circle, and learners' levels of understanding are evaluated by equating their actual academic performance against a predetermined benchmark or academic standard. Depending on the situation, assessment could also be carried out at the end of the overall learning exercise, which is referred to as an assessment of learning.

Assessment of learning, also known as summative assessment, is a crucial component of the evaluation process. Bakhshaliyeva (2023) opines that summative assessment serves as a means to evaluate students' overall academic achievement and understanding of instructional content after the completion of the learning period. This type of assessment provides valuable feedback to both students and educators, helping to clarify areas of weakness and strength and inform future instructional decisions. In an assessment of learning, the primary goal is to measure and evaluate the knowledge and skills that students have assimilated at the end of a learning period. This is typically done through tests, quizzes, exams, and other summative assessments (Premkumar, 2016).

One of the key purposes of assessment of learning, according to Shikhaliyeva (2022), is to determine the extent to which learners have been able to accomplish the learning objectives

set out for a particular course or unit of study. By assessing students' knowledge and skills against predetermined criteria, teachers can determine whether students have successfully met the intended learning outcomes. This information is essential for ensuring the smooth progression of students on track to meet academic standards. Assessment of learning also provides valuable feedback to students, helping them realise their points of weakness and strength and identify areas that need improvement. By evaluating students' performance at the completion of the learning period, teachers can assess the efficiency of their chosen method of teaching and curriculum design (Khasawneh, 2021).

This evidence can be useful in making informed decisions about instructional practices, curriculum development, and resource allocation, ultimately leading to improved students' outcomes. In this regard, assessment is viewed as a diagnostic tool that helps the teacher determine learners' needs and make informed decisions while the programme is ongoing. In this context, it is called assessment for learning. Assessment for learning, which could also be regarded as formative assessment, is the process of gathering information about students' understanding and progress through the learning process. According to Hidayat, Sujadi, Siswanto and Usodo (2023), assessment for learning examines students' level of comprehension and understanding of skills or lessons in the course of the teaching and learning process. It is an ongoing assessment process that provides feedback to students and teachers during learning. This is otherwise known as assessment as learning. This aspect of the assessment process occurs throughout the learning experience and is basically designed to generate and give information to students and teachers, giving opportunity for modification during teaching and learning where it is necessary to aim at enhancing learning outcomes. Assessment for learning is focused on identifying student strengths and areas for improvement, guiding instructional decisions, and promoting student engagement and motivation (Evans, 2017).

Assessment "for or of" learning creates a continuous feedback loop where students receive information concerning their level of performance, understand their progress, and are encouraged to reflect on their learning. This feedback is not just about grades. Eyers and Hill (2016) asserted that it is also about specific areas of improvement, strategies for growth, and next steps in their learning journey. Beyond the feedback loops, it enhances student engagement. By involving students in the assessment process, assessment for learning (AFL) promotes a sense of ownership and responsibility for their learning. Assessment for learning allows teachers to deplore instructional strategies that meet the diverse needs of students. By identifying students' personal strengths and weaknesses through on-going assessments, teachers can provide targeted support to help each student achieve their learning goals.

Teachers use various formative assessment strategies such as questioning, quizzes, discussions, peer feedback, and personal evaluation to monitor student progress and provide timely feedback. This feedback guides instruction, clarifies learning goals, and helps students reflect on their learning process. Through the evaluation of the result of the assessment, the areas where students may be excelling or facing some difficulties will be discovered by the teacher, thereby making adequate provisions to make tailored modifications to the teaching method to enable both the teacher and student to achieve the required goal. For example, suppose a formative assessment reveals that a group of students find it difficult or struggles with a particular academic task. In that case, teachers can adjust their lesson plans and employ relevant instructional strategies to provide additional support and resources to help those students master the content area.

Furthermore, in assessment for learning, Conerty (2022) advocates teachers acting as facilitators of learning, guiding students through the assessment process and helping them to

reflect on their learning and progress. By engaging with students, teachers can diagnose areas where learners may have learning difficulties and provide the best possible support to help them improve. This approach also encourages learners to be responsible for their learning progress and advancement towards desirable skills such as self-assessment, self-regulation, and goal-setting. Assessment for learning, according to Chen (2021), helps to create positive and supportive learning grounds that place value on students' capabilities, where they are motivated and encouraged to take risks and make mistakes as an element of the learning process. By actively engaging with students and providing on-going support and feedback, teachers can help to foster a growth mindset and a culture of continuous improvement in the classroom.

Teachers play a significant role in ensuring effective implementation of all assessment forms, either assessment for learning or assessment of learning. Catherine Garrison and Michael Ehringhaus, in their book "Formative and Summative Assessment in the Classroom," as cited by Notar and Allanson, (2018), pointed out that the more data teachers are able to generate and also gather during academic engagement of students, the better equipped educators are with relevant and vital information that will enable them forecast desirable outcome and also adjust instructional strategies and intervention plans where it is necessary. Comprehensive information on a learner's academic and behavioural patterns gives teachers a clear image of a particular learner. These enable teachers to focus on students' areas of special need and attention. Continuous assessment also helps the students to check and rate their performance, as this could either help the learner improve or stabilize efforts in the cognitive domain of learning.

The cognitive domain refers to the mental skills, intellectual abilities, and processes that enable individuals to acquire, process, store, and retrieve information (Huang et al., 2019). This domain is often associated with advanced reasoning skills, such as thinking critically, analysing concepts correctly, and synthesising and evaluating concepts correctly. The cognitive domain focuses on knowledge and understanding. The cognitive processes are essential for learning, problem-solving, and decision-making in various academic, professional, and everyday contexts. Assessing students in the cognitive domain goes beyond simply testing their memorization skills; it delves into their ability to analyse, evaluate, and create new ideas based on their acquired knowledge. This assessment often includes tasks that require critical thinking, problem-solving, and application of concepts to real-world scenarios. By measuring students' knowledge and understanding, educators can gain insights into their overall academic performance and identify further improvement and development areas. Another domain of learning that also helps in determining the effectiveness of teaching methods and curriculum innovation, facilitates deep learning and conceptual understanding, and influences attitudes towards schooling, belief systems, and values that learners hold in high esteem is the affective domain.

As noted by Sugirin (2010), the affective domain refers to the emotional and attitudinal aspects of learning, including students' feelings, values, beliefs, and motivations toward the subject matter. It involves assessing and developing students' attitudes, interests, and values to enhance their overall learning experience and personal growth. In the affective domain, educators focus on nurturing students' social and emotional skills, fostering empathy, promoting self-awareness, and encouraging positive attitudes toward learning. Assessing the affective domain involves understanding students' emotional responses to learning tasks, engagement level, and ability to collaborate with others. By addressing the affective domain, educators can establish a supportive and inclusive learning platform that promotes holistic development and enhances students' overall well-being. The affective domain focuses on attitudes and values. Academic assessment across these domains allows educators to evaluate students'

comprehension, emotional responses, and practical abilities. By assessing all three domains, educators can comprehensively understand students' overall learning experiences, address diverse learning needs, and promote holistic development. According to Njura, Kaberia and Taaliu (2020), the psychomotor domain involves the development of physical skills, coordination, and muscle memory. It encompasses performing tasks requiring physical dexterity, precision, and coordination through practice and repetition.

In the psychomotor domain, learners engage in activities that require integrating cognitive processes with physical movements. This domain focuses on developing skills that involve manipulating various body parts, gross motor skills, and the ability to manipulate objects with precision. Mastery in the psychomotor domain is achieved through constant practice, feedback, and refinement of movements to perform tasks effectively and efficiently. Educators often use hands-on activities, simulations, and practical exercises to facilitate learning and skill development in this domain. By honing psychomotor skills, learners can enhance their ability to perform complex physical tasks and activities in various contexts.

Assessing the psychomotor domain allows educators to measure students' physical skills, coordination, and ability to perform specific tasks accurately and efficiently. This type of assessment provides insights into students' application of knowledge in real-world contexts, their mastery of technical skills, and their ability to demonstrate competency in performing physical activities. By incorporating assessments in the psychomotor domain, educators can evaluate students' practical abilities and provide targeted feedback to support their skill development and overall academic growth. Through comprehensive assessment across the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains, educators can tailor their teaching strategies to cater for different learning approaches and preferences. By recognizing and addressing individual levels of competence and areas that need possible re-enforcement for improvement in each domain, educators can create a more inclusive and engaging learning environment. This strategy not only improves academic performance, it also fosters personal growth, critical thinking skills, and a thick connection to the instructional content. Ultimately, holistic assessment across these domains supports students in developing a well-rounded skill set that prepares them for academic, professional, and personal success. But unfortunately, teachers in most secondary schools do not take time to assess learners comprehensively in the three domains of learning, this was the basis why Agi and Oteyi (2021) pointed out that teachers in public secondary schools assesses their learners inadequately by putting much emphasis and effort on tests and final examinations while continuous assessments in affective, psychomotor domain of learning are being neglected. While stressing the need for holistic assessment in the three domains of learning, Birehanu (2014) concluded that continuous assessment can only function effectively if the teacher implements it properly in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of learning, as this will help in effectively grooming the learners holistically.

Statement of the Problem

Continuous assessment is used at various levels of learning to assess and evaluate learners' actualisation of instructional objectives periodically or holistically. It is a system of assessment carried out at pre-determined intervals regularly to monitor the progress of the educational process. Literature indicates that the practice of continuous assessment at various levels in the educational system in Nigeria concentrates more on the cognitive aspect of learning than the affective domain which deals with the feelings, interest, attitude, values, dispositions that learners developed during the learning processes and psychomotor domain of learning which

deals with manipulative skills development like dancing skills, swimming, typing skills etc. The continuous neglect of the affective and psychomotor domain of learning and over-emphasising on the cognitive domain in the Nigerian educational system contributes to the current high level of unemployment in Nigeria, because little or less attention is given to the exploration and discovery of non-cognitive skills which are catalyst to entrepreneurial development that takes tertiary institution graduates off the street in search for white collar jobs and make them to be self-reliance. Continuous assessments were meant to be all-encompassing and holistic, using various forms of techniques such as achievement tests, interest tests, verbal (written) quizzes, group assignments, individualised tasks, homework, projects, check–list peer assessments, and questionnaires. Continuous assessment relies on valid information and provides accurate feedback data and remediation to improve students' learning outcomes. However, many teachers do not consider assessing the students holistically, thereby examining the non-cognitive well-being of the learners. The few teachers who assess their learners in those non-cognitive aspects lack the technical ability and skills to construct good and reliable instruments that could elicit valid and reliable information. On this premise, the present study will further investigate how teachers carry out continuous assessment in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain of learning.

Purpose of the Study

The study sought to assess how teachers carry out continuous assessment in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of learning in public secondary schools in Uyo Local Government Area.

Specifically, the study seeks to determine:

(i). How is continuous assessment carried out in the cognitive domain of learning?

(ii). how continuous assessment is carried out in the affective domain of learning

(iii). how continuous assessment is carried out in the psychomotor domain of learning

Research Questions

1. How do teachers assess the cognitive domain in public secondary schools in Uyo Local Government Area?
2. How do teachers assess the affective domain in Uyo Local Government Area public secondary schools?
3. How do teachers assess the psychomotor domain in Uyo Local Government Area public secondary schools?

Research Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. A survey research design involves collecting data to accurately and objectively describe existing phenomena using a population representative. Kerlinger (2000) describes this design as that which is directed towards determining the nature of a situation as it exists at the time of investigation. One hundred twenty teachers constituted the sample size for the study, simple random sampling technique was used to randomly select eight (8) out of the fourteen (14) public secondary schools in Uyo Local Educational Committee and 15 teachers were also randomly selected in each school, making a total of 120 respondents that took part in the study.

A self-structured "Teacher's Techniques of Continuous Assessment Questionnaire" (TTCAQ) was used to capture data. The researchers developed " TTCAQ " through extensive

consultation with teachers and literature review. It was used to measure how teachers assess the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain of learning on a 4-point Likert-type scale response option of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The instrument was trial tested on 50 teachers in 5 secondary schools in Eket senatorial district, which is not part of the sample area. TTCAQ had an overall reliability coefficient .88 measuring internal consistency of all the items in the instrument, while the first subscale measuring how teachers carry out continuous assessment in the cognitive domain had a reliability coefficient of .83 and the second subscale measuring how teachers assess the affective domain had a reliability coefficient of .82, while the third subscale measuring how teachers assess the psychomotor domain had a reliability coefficient of .81. Data were analyse using descriptive statistic

Results

Research Question One: How do teachers assess the cognitive domain in Uyo Local Government Area public secondary schools?

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of teachers' responses on how they carry out continuous assessment in the cognitive domain in public secondary schools

How teachers carry out assessment in the cognitive domain	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
I construct test items using table of specification	5 (4%)	14 (12%)	38 (12%)	62 (53%)
I conduct test requiring students ability to recall information	61 (51%)	30 (25%)	11 (9%)	18 (15%)
My test do seek students' ability to restate problems in their own words	74 (62%)	38 (32%)	6 (5%)	2 (1%)
My test do seek students' ability to apply ideas in new situations	50 (42%)	27 (23%)	23 (19%)	20 (17%)
I construct test requiring students' ability to break down information into simple components.	55 (46%)	52 (43%)	6 (5%)	7 (6%)
I do test my students' ability to answer question, to put together ideas to respond to items	63 (53%)	38 (32%)	14 (12%)	5 (4%)
My test do seek students' ability to place value judgment on data in order to take decision.	68 (57%)	27 (23%)	15 (12%)	10 (8%)

The results in Table 4.1 indicate that 62 (53%) of the sampled respondents strongly disagreed that they construct test items using tables of specification. In comparison, 61 (51%) of the respondents strongly agreed that they conduct tests requiring students' ability to recall information. Concerning whether teachers construct tests examining their students' ability to restate problems in their own words, 74 (62%) of the sampled respondents strongly agreed. 50 (42%) of the sampled respondents strongly agreed that they construct test that seek students' ability to apply ideas in new situations. In comparison, 55 (46%) of sampled teachers strongly agreed that they construct tests requiring students' ability to break down information into simple components. 63 (53%) of the sampled teachers strongly agreed that they do construct test to examine they students' ability to answer questions, put together ideas to respond to items and 68

(57%) of the sample teachers strongly agreed that they construct test that seek they students' ability to place value judgment on data in order to take decision.

Research Question Two: How do teachers assess the affective domain in public secondary schools in Uyo Local Government Area?

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of teachers' responses on how they carry out continuous assessment in the affective domain in public secondary schools

How teachers carry out assessment in the affective domain	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
I construct test requiring students' ability to do homework on time.	3 (2%)	8 (7%)	43 (36%)	66 (55%)
I construct test requiring students' ability to participate actively in class.	8 (7%)	31 (25%)	25 (21%)	56 (47%)
My tests do seek students' level of carefulness attached to equipment during practical classes.	64 (53%)	33 (28%)	17 (14%)	6 (5%)
I construct test requiring students' ability to bring together different values to resolve conflicts among themselves.	2 (2%)	3 (3%)	17 (13%)	98 (82%)
I construct test that seek to assess students' value system that has controlled their behaviour.	38 (32%)	20 (17%)	10 (8%)	52 (43%)

The result in Table 2 indicates that 66 (55%) of the sampled respondents strongly disagreed that they construct tests requiring their students' ability to do homework on time. In comparison, 56 (47%) of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests requiring students' ability to participate actively in class. 64 (53%) of the sampled respondents strongly agreed that they construct test that seek students' level of carefulness attached to equipment during practical classes. 98 (82%) of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests requiring students' ability to bring together different values to resolve conflicts among themselves, and 52(43%) of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests that seek to assess students' value system that has controlled their behaviour.

Research Question Three: How do teachers assess the psychomotor domain in Uyo Local Government Area public secondary schools?

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of teachers' responses on how they carry out continuous assessment in the psychomotor domain in public secondary schools

How teachers carry out assessment in the psychomotor domain	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
My test seek learners' capability to utilize their sense organs in decoding messages that aid physical performance	36 (30%)	41 (34%)	25 (21%)	18 (15%)

I construct test to assess students' readiness to a particular type of action	7 (6%)	12 (10%)	28 (23%)	73 (61%)
I construct test to assess my students' ability to trial task	3 (3%)	7 (6%)	16 (13%)	94 (78%)
I construct test requiring students' ability to performance acts that becomes habitual with some confidence	6 (5%)	10 (8%)	18 (15%)	86 (72%)
I construct test requiring my students' ability to perform complex body movement that are highly coordinated.	2 (2%)	8 (7%)	21 (18%)	89 (74%)
I construct test to assess my students' ability to modify body movement to meet a particular demand.	5 (4%)	14 (12%)	38 (12%)	62 (53%)
I construct test to assess my students ability to create new body movement patterns to fit a particular situation	18 (15%)	30 (25%)	11 (9%)	61 (51%)

The results in Table 3 indicate that 41 (34%) of the sampled respondents agreed that they construct tests that seek students' ability to use their sense organs to obtain cues that guide motor skills. In comparison, 73 (61%) of respondents strongly disagreed that they construct tests to assess students' readiness for a particular type of action. 94 (78%) of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests to assess their students' ability to trial tasks. 86 (72%) of the sampled respondents strongly disagreed that they construct tests requiring students' ability to perform acts that become habitual with some confidence, and 89 (74%) of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests requiring students' ability to perform complex body movements that are highly coordinated. 62 (53%) of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests to assess their students' ability to modify body movement to meet a particular demand, and 61 (51%). The sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they constructed tests to assess their students' ability to create new body movement patterns to fit a particular situation.

Discussion

Considering how teachers assess the cognitive domain of learning in public secondary schools, over half of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct test items using table of specification, this implies that teachers in public secondary schools do not construct standardised test, they write test items without putting into serious consideration the psychometric properties of the test items. As regards that first level in the cognitive domain of learning, which is knowledge, over fifty per cent of the sample teachers strongly agreed that they conduct tests requiring students' ability to recall information. This means that teachers construct test items at the knowledge level to assess the cognitive domain of learning. This finding lends credence to the conclusion of Abiy (2013), who pointed out that a typical Nigerian secondary school teacher practices continuous testing and not continuous assessment. This implies that teachers are constantly evaluating only the cognitive domain of learning.

Concerning whether teachers construct tests that examine their students' ability to restate problems in their own words, over half of the sampled respondents strongly agreed. This means that teachers assess their students at the second level in the cognitive domain of learning. Exactly fifty per cent of the sampled respondents strongly agreed that they construct tests that seek

students' ability to apply ideas in new situations. This means the teachers in public secondary schools construct application questions for their students. 46% of sampled teachers strongly agreed that they construct test requiring students' ability to break down information into simple components. This implies that only a few teachers in the sampled schools construct test items that require analysis for their students. 53% of the sampled teachers strongly agreed that they do construct test to examine they students' ability to answer questions, put together ideas to respond to items, this means that half of the sampled teachers do construct synthesis questions and 57% of the sample teachers strongly agreed that they construct test that seek they students' ability to place value judgment on data in order to take decision, this implies that half of the sampled teachers construct evaluation test items for their students. The findings agree with the directive of the Federal Ministry of Education (FME, 2004) that teachers should use different types of continuous assessment techniques in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain of learning and grade the learners. This finding is in support of the assertion of Meherns and Lehman (1991), who believed that continuous assessment must not be limited to conventional paper–and–pencil achievement tests; instead, they must use various assessment techniques like rating scales, checklists, and observation, which examine the affective and psychomotor domain of learning.

On how teachers in public schools carry our assessment in the affective domain of learning, it was discovered that most teachers do not construct test at the first level (receiving) of the affective domain of learning as over half of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct test requiring their students' ability to do homework on time, 47% of the sampled teachers also strongly disagreed that they construct test requiring students' ability to participate actively in class, this implies that teachers in public schools do not construct test items on the second (responding) level of the affective domain of learning. Over fifty percent of the sampled teachers strongly agreed that they construct test that seek students' level of carefulness attached to equipment during practical classes. This means that many teachers in public schools do construct test on the third level (valuing) of the affective domain of learning. A greater percent of the sampled respondents (82%) strongly disagreed that they construct test requiring students' ability to bring together different values to resolve conflicts among themselves, this implies that the teachers do not construct test on the fourth (organisation) level of affective domain of learning 43% of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct test that seek to assess students' value system that has controlled their behaviour, this means that most teachers in public schools do not construct on the fifth (characterisation by value complex)of the affective domain of learning. This finding supports the report of Abonyi (2011), who opines that measuring the affective and psychomotor domains of learning has been neglected by teachers due to incompetence in constructing instruments to elicit valid assessment data.

On the psychomotor domain of learning, the findings of the study revealed that almost half of the sampled teachers agreed that they construct test that seek students' ability to use their sense organs to obtain cues that guide motor, this means that most teachers in public schools do not construct test on the first level (perception) of the psychomotor domain of learning. At the same time, over fifty percent of respondents strongly disagreed that they construct tests to assess students' readiness for a particular type of action. This means that many teachers do not construct tests on the second level (set) of the psychomotor domain of learning in public secondary schools.

Most of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests to assess their students' ability to trial task; this implies that many teachers in the public schools do not construct tests on

the third level (guided response) of the psychomotor domain of learning. 72% of the sampled respondents strongly disagreed that they construct tests requiring students' ability to perform acts that become habitual with some confidence. This means that teachers in public secondary schools do not construct tests on the fourth level (mechanism) of the psychomotor domain of learning. The majority of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests requiring students' ability to perform complex body movements that are highly coordinated. This means that teachers in public secondary schools do not construct tests on the fifth level (complex overt response) of the psychomotor domain of learning. Half of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct tests to assess their students' ability to modify body movement to meet a particular demand, this means that teachers in public secondary schools do not construct test on the sixth level (adaptation) of the psychomotor domain an fifty percent of the sampled teachers strongly disagreed that they construct test to assess their students ability to create new body movement patterns to fit a particular situation, this means that majority of teachers do not construct test on the seventh level (origination) of the psychomotor domain of learning. This finding is in concordance with the assertion of Idown and Esere (2009), they concluded that cognitive bases assessment as practice in schools cannot yield meaningful result, they went further to emphasise the fact that cognitive assessment should merge with affective and psychomotor assessment so that the outcome could be used to guide the learners growth and development. This implies that the comprehensiveness of continuous assessment rests with the classroom teacher because the teachers must consider the holistic aspects of the child's development (cognitive, affective and psychomotor) in overall student achievement assessment. Similarly, Birehanu (2014) concluded that continuous assessment can only be effective and yield expected results if the teacher implements it accordingly. This means that teachers in most educational settings in Nigeria do not clearly understand the procedures for properly implementing continuous assessment.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study's findings revealed that teachers in public secondary schools concentrate more on the cognitive domain of learning during continuous assessment, thereby neglecting the affective and psychomotor aspects of learning. This practice has hindered the development of talents and vocational skills that drive the 21st-century economy. It is recommended that:

1. The principal of post-primary schools and education monitoring terms should always emphasise and ensure that secondary school teachers adequately cover the three behavioural domains of learning in their continuous assessment in public secondary schools. Students' continuous assessment should be both scholastic and non-scholastic competence.
2. Students should be encouraged by their teachers to develop their natural potential through a keen interest in the affective domain of learning. Examining the affective domain of learning will help to diagnose attitudinal factors that could hinder learning progress or cause the student(s) to develop a negative attitude towards academics.
3. Government and various stakeholders in education should organise conferences, workshops and seminars for teachers in public schools on the use of various non-scholastics measurement instruments to enable the development of the full potentials of learners.
4. The government should employ more teachers in public schools to reduce the workload and enable teachers to implement continuous assessment effectively in the affective and

psychomotor domain of learning. This domain requires more attention to be given to individual students.

References

Abiy, Y. (2013). High school English teachers' and students' perceptions, attitudes and actual practices of continuous assessment. *Academic Journals, 8(16),1489-1498*.

Abonyi, O. S. (2011). Instrumentation in Behavioral Research: A practical Approach. Enugu: Fulladu Publishing Company.

Akpan, E. C & Ikechukwu, C. O. (2018). Teacher's perception of continuous assessment, a mechanism for quality assurance in Enugu State primary school. An unpublished M.Ed thesis, Enugu State

Agi, U. K. & Oyeti, J. V. (2021). Continuous assessment and students' learning outcome in public senior secondary schools in Rivers State. *Journal of Teacher Perspective, 16(1).*

Bakhshaliyeva, A. (2023). Methods and means used in summative assessment. *Bulletin of Postgraduate Education (Series)*, *25*(54), 26–43. https://doi.org/10.58442/2218-7650-2023-25(54)-26-43

Birhanu, M. (2014). Continuous assessment issues and practice in secondary schools of Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia.*The Big Picture of Assessment Mechanism.* Retrieve from http://www.palgojournals.org.

Chen, H. (2021, January 22). Establish the Individual Learnings Space and Create the Wisdom Learning Environment. *Science Insights Education Frontiers, 8*(S1), 1. https://doi.org/10.15354/sief.21.s1.ab012

Conerty, J. J. (2022, January 26). Review of Making school relevant with individualized learning plans: Helping students create their own career and life goals. *Education Review, 29*. https://doi.org/10.14507/er.v29.3369

Evans, E. L. (2017). Quality Improvement in Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: Faculty Learning, Collaboration, Engagement, and Transparency. *Assessment Update*, *29*(3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/au.30091

Eyers, G., and Hill, M. (2016). Improving Student learning? Research evidence about teacher feedback for improvement in New Zealand schools. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.15663/wje.v10i1.345

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). National policy on education (4th ed.). Abuja: NERDC.

Hidayat, R., Sujadi, I., Siswanto, and Usodo, B. (2023). Description of Assessment: Assessment for Learning and Assessment as Learning on Teacher Learning Assessment. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, *7*(4), 653–661. https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v7i4.59950

Huang, W., Xiao, X., & Xu, M. (2019, October). Design and implementation of domain-specific cognitive system based on question similarity algorithm. *Cognitive Systems Research*, *57*, 20–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2018.10.003

Idown, A. & Esere, M. (2019). Using assessment to improve the quality of education. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Education Planning.

Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2021, September 9). The Relationship of Curriculum, Teaching Methods, Assessment Methods, and School and Home Environment with Learning Difficulties in

English Language from the Students' Perspectives. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, *23*, 285–295. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v23i1.4117

Lakkala, S., Galkienė, A., Navaitienė, J., Cierpiałowska, T., Tomecek, S., & Uusiautti, S. (2021, March 5). Teachers Supporting Students in Collaborative Ways—An Analysis of Collaborative Work Creating Supportive Learning Environments for Every Student in a School: Cases from Austria, Finland, Lithuania, and Poland. *Sustainability*, *13*(5), 2804. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052804

Meherns, W. & Lehman, J. (1991). Measurement and Evalaution in Education and Psychology. 4th ed., Wadsworth, Thomson Learning.

Njura, H. J., Kaberia, I. K., & Taaliu, S. T. (2020). Teaching secondary school agriculture at the psychomotor domain: a conceptual framework for enhanced skills development for food security. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, *27*(2), 111–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/1389224x.2020.1816479

Notar, C. E., and Allanson, P. E. (2018). A Practical Guide to Assessment Literacy. Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 5(8), 633-641. https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.58.5013

Premkumar, K. (2016). Use of Student Response Systems for Summative Assessments. *Creative Education*, *07*(13), 1851–1860. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2016.713187

Shikhaliyeva, I. V. (2022). Impact of summative assessment on learning quality. *Humanities Science Current Issues*, (50), 445–450. https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/50-70

Siagian, A. F., Ibrahim, M., & Supardi, Z. A. I. (2023, January 9). Creative-scientific decision-making skills learning model for training creative thinking skills and student decision making skills. *Nurture*, *17*(1), 10–17. https://doi.org/10.55951/nurture.v17i1.141

Sugirin, S. (2010, November 25). AFFECTIVE DOMAIN DEVELOPMENT: REALITY AND EXPECTATION. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, *3*(3). https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v3i3.357