



## **Rethinking Trends in Instructional Objectives: Exploring the Alignment of Objectives with Activities and Assessment in Higher Education – A Case Study**

**Akio Yamanaka**

University of Northern Colorado, United States, [akio.yamanaka@akoism.com](mailto:akio.yamanaka@akoism.com)

**Leon Yufeng Wu**

National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan, [leonyufengwu@gmail.com](mailto:leonyufengwu@gmail.com)

This study explored higher education level syllabi to identify trends in educational objectives. Bloom's Taxonomy and various strategic models were used to classify 714 objectives from 114 sections of courses administered through a Midwest teacher education institution in the United States. 1229 verbs and verb phrases were classified through the Taxonomy and differentiated between higher and lower ordered verbs as well as measureable and non-measureable learning outcomes. The results indicated that though learning outcomes the objectives are suggestive of higher ordered skills although the syllabi do not adequately provide information on the expected outcomes of the course.

Keywords: Instructional Design; Objectives; Bloom's Taxonomy; Syllabus; Higher Order Skill.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Educational objectives are an integral part of lesson planning, primarily in identifying intended behavioral outcomes of students. Objectives define "where you are headed and how to demonstrate when you have arrived" (Kaufman, 2000, p. 44), emphasizing the end outcome or results that are intended to be exhibited by the learner. According to Mager (1984), objectives are critical in selecting appropriate materials and procedures, promoting instructor ingenuity, providing consistent and measurable results, setting goal posts for students, and realizing instructional efficiency. Some common use of objectives among teachers include activity and assessment alignment, clarification of goals to students, and responses to calls for accountability by administrators and policymakers (Anderson, et. al., 2001; Morrison, Ross, & Kemp, 2004).

Teachers have long incorporated a set of taxonomy to assist in creating their objectives for scaffolding learning within levels of cognitive processes (Bloom, 1956; Anderson et. al., 2001; Marzano, 2007). As the demand for learning complex skills have become a vital area of concern for educators, objectives are useful in helping teachers not only

align objectives with lesson plans and assessment to clarify intended outcomes, but also methodically design effective and efficient learning of higher cognitive skills that will transfer in real world contexts (Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2009). The importance of higher order learning has been documented extensively. The emphasis on career preparation (Rudd, 2007), fast paced changes in society (Zohar & Dori, 2003; Bataineh & Zghoul, 2006), diverse learners (Noble, 2004), and concerns about the educational system (Zohar & Schwartz, 2005) are some of the reasons why higher order learning has become an important factor in the context of learning for all fields of study. This includes nursing education (Zygmunt & Schaefer, 2006), Teaching English as a Foreign and Secondary Language (Bataineh & Zghoul, 2006), business (Nentl & Zietlow, 2008), reading and literacy education (Veeravagu, Muthusamy, Marimuth, 2010), and engineering (Swart, 2010; Pappas, Pierrakos, & Nagel, 2013). The following writing and referencing rules for educational objectives are to be taken into consideration.

### **Bloom's Taxonomy**

The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Bloom, 1956), often referred to as Bloom's Taxonomy (or the Taxonomy or the Handbook), was intended to classify goals in the education system and offer a platform upon which educators could openly discuss and exchange ideas about curriculum development. Bloom's Taxonomy became an important objective-based evaluation tool for stating goals that aligned with identifying the intended outcomes of a program. While the original Taxonomy was broken down into three related parts (the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains), objectives from the cognitive domain, which focused on "the recall or recognition of knowledge and the development of intellectual abilities and skills" (p.7) has been the most widely recognized and utilized of the three and is the focus of this study. The six levels, beginning with the lowest tier, include Knowledge, Comprehension, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation. In general, lower levels of the taxonomy correspond to behavioral outcomes that assess memorization and recalling of facts; higher levels of taxonomy correspond to more complex learning outcomes that facilitate critical thinking and problem solving of abstract knowledge (Bloom, 1956).

### **Mager and ABCD Models of Writing Objectives**

According to Mager (1984), performance is a visible or overt behavior (as opposed to abstract behavior) that the learner is expected to do to demonstrate a mastery of the objective. However, Mager does recognize covert or invisible performances such as a student demonstrating the ability solve a problem, and suggests writing an indicator behavior that demonstrates "directly whether a covert performance is happening to our satisfaction" (p. 77). Conditions refer to the conditions under which the students must perform to prevent miscommunication or confusion. The criterion is the level of competence that is needed, or the acceptable performance that a student must reach to be considered competent. Mager's model specifies that an objective should not merely describe a process for reaching a goal, but to describe an intended outcome that is

measurable and specific. They should focus on student performance rather than describe an instructor's performance, which Mager refers to as "administrative" objectives.

A more recent strategy of writing objectives, which incorporates many of the qualities from Mager's model, contains four components: the audience (A), the behavior (B) the conditions (C), and the degree (D). In the ABCD strategy, the behavior correlates to Mager's performance and the degree to his criterion.

### **Purpose of Study**

A primary goal of this research is to analyze syllabi from higher education courses and to assess trends in the course objectives by identifying the classification levels at which they are written. This research also seeks to examine their relationship to lesson activities and assessment procedures and discern its clarity as an explicit communication tool between the instructor and the student. The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. At what levels of Bloom's Taxonomy are most educational objectives written?
2. Do the objectives follow the Mager or the ABCD model of writing objectives; that is, do they clearly specify a measurable learning outcome, conditions under which the behavior will occur, and the degree or criterion of acceptable behavior?
3. Do lesson activities and assessment correspond to the objectives?
4. Is there a correlation between course level (undergraduate and graduate) and level of objectives?

### **METHOD**

#### **Material**

Syllabi were collected from professors teaching undergraduate and graduate level courses at a Midwest higher education institution in the United States. This included programs from the School of Educational Research, Leadership, and Technology; the School of Psychological Sciences; the School of Applied Psychology and Counselor Education; the School of Special Education; and the School of Teacher Education. Syllabi from such institution were purposefully sampled due to the higher likelihood that professors in these departments would be familiar with Bloom's Taxonomy.

#### **Instrument**

The instrument used in this research consisted of a Syllabus Information Checklist and four sections that correlate to the four research questions.

##### *Syllabus Information Checklist*

The purpose of the checklist was to retrieve background information on the structure of the course from the syllabi that may become useful in discussing the results of subsequent sections. Various information were collected, identifying 20 elements that could be categorized as: a) All are clear, exist or true; b) Somewhat clear, some parts

are missing, somewhat true; c) Not clear, does not exist, or not true; and d) Not applicable.

#### *Bloom's Taxonomy Classification*

Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives was used as a guideline for classifying the verbs and verb phrases by taxonomy level. In the process of classifying the objectives, each syllabus was examined for a Course Objectives (or similar) section. The objectives were listed and enumerated. From these objectives, each of the learning outcomes (in the form of a verb or verb phrase) was extracted and assessed by taxonomy level. In order to accommodate cases where the objective levels could not be determined, such learner outcomes classified in a separate category labeled "unclassifiable" (UC).

In cases where more than one learning outcome was specified in an objective, each verb or verb phrase was analyzed and classified as distinct learning outcomes within the same objective. In cases where the syllabus included sub-objectives, each objective and sub-objective was differentiated. The main objective was numbered and subsequent sub-objectives were numbered using alphabetical characters. The number of main objectives (those objectives that do not count the sub-objectives) and total objectives (the total number of main and sub-objectives) were recorded

#### *Measurability, Conditions, and Criteria*

The Mager and the ABCD model of preparing instructional objectives were used as guidelines in assessing the measurability, conditions, and criteria of the objectives. Each of the learning outcomes was categorized as measureable verbs, non-measureable verbs, or non-discernable verbs (where verbs were administrative objectives). The ABCD model's strategy of not differentiating between behaviors was implemented, thus both overt and covert behaviors were classified as measureable. The objectives were also assessed for conditions under which the behavior will occur and the degree or criterion of acceptable behavior.

#### *Lesson Activities and Assessment Data*

Each of the syllabi was reviewed for a description or itemization of the lesson activities, requirements, and assignments. The taxonomy level (if applicable), the corresponding objective or objectives (if applicable), and a description of the activity were noted in a data sheet. Each syllabus was examined for a section describing the grading criteria or assessment procedures. The taxonomy level (if applicable), the corresponding objective, and corresponding activity were reported.

#### *Higher and Lower Level Classification*

In addition to classifying the objectives using Bloom's Taxonomy, they were also differentiated into lower, higher, or non-discernable levels. The purpose of separating the verbs into these categories was twofold. The primary reason was to differentiate

intended outcomes between higher order skills and lower order skills. The second reason was to identify learner outcomes that could not be accounted for in Bloom's system of classifying objectives. The intent was to accommodate the problem of overlapping verbs indicated in the literature. As an example, the verb "understand" and the verb phrase "demonstrate understanding" were often used in the objectives. Without further clarification, these words could be classified in either knowledge (simply recalling the information) or comprehension (translating, interpreting, and describing the information) levels. A distinction should be made between such verb phrases to those such as "demonstrate pride" or "develop sensibility" whereby, in the former case, with conditions and criteria, the performance can be measured. In such cases where the taxonomy level could not be determined but were indicative of recalling, recognizing, interpreting information, the learning outcome was reported as not classifiable but recorded in the "lower" category. Other examples include "demonstrate knowledge," "demonstrate proficiency," and "develop understanding."

In maintaining consistency with the literature review, knowledge and comprehension classification levels were reported as lower level objectives and the remaining four levels were reported as higher level objectives.

#### **Data Collection**

In order to guarantee that the course objectives corresponded to the most recent goals of each program, syllabi were collected only from the active sections of courses from one recent Spring semester. A comprehensive list of 483 courses from the College of Education was created from the online university record system. An assumption was made that differing sections of the same course taught by the same instructor would use the same syllabus. Thus, the total number was recalculated to provide a better estimate of the number of distinct syllabi, altering the total number to 342. Requests for syllabi were sent electronically to 143 instructors on record as well as one administrative assistant. The requests were made mainly to those instructors on record whose email addresses were available through the university website.

#### **Data Analysis**

After the data were individually categorized, the sum totals for graduate and undergraduate level courses were recorded on data sheets. The analysis of the data consisted of focusing on answering the research questions:

##### *Research Question 1*

In order to answer the first research question, "At what levels are most educational objectives written?" an aggregate count of the total number of learning outcomes by Bloom's Taxonomy level were analyzed and reported by undergraduate levels, graduate levels, and total (the sum of undergraduate and graduate levels).

##### *Research Question 2*

In order to answer the second question, "Do the objectives follow the Mager or the ABCD model of writing objectives; that is, do they clearly specify a measurable learning outcome, conditions under which the behavior will occur, and the degree or

criterion of acceptable behavior?" Each learning outcome was assessed and reported for measurability, conditions, and criteria.

#### *Research Question 3*

In order to answer the third question, "Do lesson activities and assessment correspond to the objectives?" Common themes from the lesson activities and assessment procedures were then grouped, and an aggregate count was tabulated from the data.

#### *Research Question 4*

In order to answer the question, "Is there a correlation between course level and level of objectives?" the syllabi were divided into graduate and undergraduate courses. The total number of "higher," "lower," and non-discernable levels were separately counted for both undergraduate and graduate levels. Those levels that could not be classifiable were labeled "not discernable" and were taken out, and the remaining data of higher levels and lower levels for both undergraduate courses and graduate courses were assessed through the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software.

### **RESULTS & FINDINGS**

Instructors teaching 130 sections responded through email. Among the responses, instructors of 15 sections reported that syllabi were not available namely due to the nature of the course being an internship, seminar, or practicum. Furthermore, one syllabus was in a file format that could not be viewed. Thus, the results consisted of aggregated data collected from the remaining 114 syllabi (33.33% response rate) of which 57 (50%) of the syllabi were undergraduate courses (100 to 400 levels) and 57 (50%) were graduate level courses (500-700 levels). One of the syllabi was listed as a 500 level course, however, because the name of the course specifically stated that the class was intended for undergraduate students, this syllabus was included in the data group calculated for the undergraduate courses.

#### **Syllabus Information**

The data collected from the Syllabus Information Checklist indicated that 38 of the 114 syllabi listed objectives under a section name that was something other than "Objectives," "Course Objectives," or "Educational Objectives." Many alternate names included "Goals and Objectives," "Course Goals," and "Course Outcomes." Seventeen (six undergraduate and eleven graduate) syllabi contained sub-objectives.

Syllabi from 64 course sections specified state standards or professional standards. Of the 64, course objectives were explicitly aligned to these standards in 37 cases. While only 12 lesson activities directly connected with the objectives, lesson activities from 18 syllabi were not aligned to the objectives, but directly to the state or professional standards.

The grading criteria of 85 syllabi specified how activities and assignments were graded or assessed. However, many syllabi had inconsistencies in the lesson activities and assessment procedures. Sixty-six of the syllabi included lesson activities and assessment procedures that were described in the same section and all corresponded to each other.

Furthermore, 31 syllabi included clinical experience or some type of field experience external to the classroom.

It was found that eleven (two undergraduate and nine graduate level) syllabi lacked a section describing the objectives of the course. Six (two undergraduate and four graduate level) syllabi contained all administrative objectives.

In assessing participation as a requirement of courses, out of 57 syllabi that reported participation as a grading criteria; among those, 26 explicitly stated how the student would be assessed.

### **Objective Classification**

Of the 114 syllabi, 397 and 317 main objectives were counted for undergraduate and graduate level courses, respectively. The number of total objectives (main objectives plus sub-objectives) included 572 for the undergraduate courses and 525 for the graduate courses, making the sum total of total objectives, 997. From the 997 total objectives, 1229 verbs or verb phrases were identified. These included 584 from syllabi of undergraduate courses and 645 from the graduate courses.

Among the six taxonomy levels, Application (224 or 18% of total learning outcomes), Knowledge (147 or 12% of total learning outcomes), and Synthesis (46 or 11% of total learning outcomes) level outcomes had higher numbers than the Comprehension (64 or 5% of total learning outcomes), Evaluation (55 or 4% of total learning outcomes), and Analysis (46 or 4% of total learning outcomes) levels.

The category with the highest number of learning outcomes was the Not Classifiable category (564 or 46% of total learning outcomes). These included verbs and verb phrases that were primarily affective behaviors, administrative outcomes, or vague verbs that could be categorized into more than one classification level.

### **Learning Outcome Measurability**

The measurability of an objective was an assessment of whether or not the learning outcome described what “someone would be doing when demonstrating mastery of the ‘objective’” (Mager, 1997, p. 52). As indicated earlier, there was no discrimination between overt and covert behaviors; both were classified as measurable. Of the 1229 learning outcomes, 601 (49%) were measurable (246 undergraduate and 355 graduate level), 584 (48%) were non-measurable (310 undergraduate and 271 graduate level), and 44 (4%) were administrative outcomes (28 undergraduate and 14 graduate level).

### **Conditions and Criteria**

After data for measurability were inputted, each objective and sub-objective was assessed for conditions under which the behavior will occur and for indicators of degree of criterion of acceptable behavior. In assessing the conditions, 38 of the 714 main objectives (5%) included a condition and 6 of the 714 main objectives (1%) included a degree. Three syllabi (one undergraduate and two graduate level courses) had at least one objective, assignment, and assessment that all corresponded to each other. However, there were no syllabi that contained measurable outcomes, conditions, and criteria for all of the objectives.

Of the 114 syllabi, 397 and 317 main objectives were counted for undergraduate and graduate level courses, respectively. The number of total objectives (main objectives plus sub-objectives) included 572 for the undergraduate courses and 525 for the graduate courses, making the sum total of total objectives, 997. From the 997 total objectives, 1229 verbs or verb phrases were identified. These included 584 from syllabi of undergraduate courses and 645 from the graduate courses.

#### **Lesson Activities and Assessment**

An aggregate count indicated that 288 (142 undergraduate and 146 graduate level) objectives corresponded to listed lesson activities. Of a total number of 714 main objectives, this corresponds to approximately 40% of the objectives being accounted for in the lesson activities. An aggregate count of 263 (125 undergraduate and 138 graduate level) objectives corresponded to listed assessment procedures. Thus, approximately 37% of the total numbers of main objectives are accounted for in the assessment section.

#### **Higher and Lower Levels**

The results indicate that graduate course objectives incorporate a slightly higher number of higher leveled learning outcomes, and undergraduate courses have a slightly higher number of lower leveled learning outcomes. The percentage of total number of learning outcomes is denoted in parenthesis in Table 1. The course objectives in graduate and undergraduate levels are correlated to higher and lower levels, accordingly. ( $\chi^2 = 9.828$ ,  $p < 0.01$ )

Table 1: The number of higher and lower leveled learning outcomes.

	Undergraduate (UG)	Graduate (G)	Total (UG + G)
Higher	186 (32%)	261 (44%)	447 (36%)
Lower	257 (40%)	239 (37%)	496 (40%)
Not Determined	141 (36%)	145 (40%)	286 (23%)

#### **DISCUSSION**

Despite claims that instruction in higher education are not being taught at higher levels, the results produced from the first and fourth research questions indicated that learning outcomes assessing higher ordered skills were being delineated in the objectives sampled for this research.

Bloom (1956) predicted that a large portion of intended skills would be saturated in the Comprehension level of the taxonomy. However, the aggregate count of the data indicated this level as composing only 5% of the total number of learning outcomes. As it was discussed in the methodology, the higher-lower classification sought to make up for those learning outcomes that were vague or unclear, such as “demonstrate understanding,” that seemed to alluded to lower levels. Though this analysis produced a higher number of lower level learning outcomes (40% as opposed to 36% higher level



outcomes), a mere 4% difference between the two levels may not be sufficient evidence to generalize an instructor emphasis on lower level knowledge.

Furthermore, the types of lesson activities and assessment guidelines also seem to support the idea that higher order skills were being assessed in the courses, though it may arguably be too quick to make a generalization due to the primitive nature of the analysis. Many of the activities required a synthesis of lower level knowledge, whether they involve projects, presentations, or research and data analysis. Quizzes and exams, which are often associated with, but not limited to, lower skills were included as one method of assessment for 36% of the syllabi. Though this percentage seems quite high in comparison to Bloom's classification of Knowledge and Comprehension levels reporting a combined total of 17%, the higher-lower classification of the number of lower-level learning outcomes produced a total of 40%. The 36% count would seem feasible in this adjusted range of 17% to 40%.

The discrepancy between the results and the literature may be explained not only by the type of outcomes specified, but also by the type of courses being offered through the sample. Many of the collected syllabi were from teacher training or clinical training courses seeking to facilitate learning of future instructors and counselors. Nearly 30% of the courses incorporated field experience as the dominant method of instructional delivery, and a quarter of the courses assessed students based on the performance and experiences of their field experience. As a result, this may explain the elevated number of higher level outcomes, namely those objectives that require students to apply and synthesize conceptual knowledge into novel situations. Given the nature of future professions associated with the courses administered by the College of Education and the variability in methods and strategies employed by prospective teachers in differing sites and situations, the lesson activities may suggest that the criteria for demonstrating proficiency in education related courses are not uniform from student to student, making it difficult to identify a specific behavioral outcome. Furthermore, the syllabi from the current study were collected on a voluntary basis. It is possible that other syllabi may have emphasized lower level skills but were excluded from the study given the higher likelihood that professors were knowledgeable about the nature of educational objectives alignment. Thus, the syllabi from the courses that were sampled may be considered atypical, limiting the generalizability of the findings of the current study.

#### **Communication of learning outcomes**

The second research question involved assessing whether or not educational objectives were written to include performance outcomes, conditions, and criteria. Almost half of the verbs and verb phrases contained measurable performance outcomes; however, this also suggested that more than half did not. In the current study, the learning outcomes were not assessed using the strictest form of Mager's model. Verbs and verb phrases that addressed covert behaviors were included in the aggregate total of measureable outcomes, even if indicator behaviors were not specified. According to Mager (1997), "statements that describe only the covert performance are not yet objectives...because

they do not tell us what someone must DO to demonstrate mastery of the objective” (p. 75). Thus, a more realistic analysis would have produced a greater number of outcomes that were not measurable.

Of the 114 syllabi, the results indicated that none of the syllabi contained all objectives that included a performance, condition, and criterion. Only three syllabi included some objectives that contained all three elements. The strikingly low numbers specifying conditions and criteria suggest that the syllabi do not fully communicate competence requirements as advocated by the literature.

One explanation for this phenomenon could be that instructors were not aware of or were never introduced to Bloom’s Taxonomy or the Mager and the ABCD models of writing instructional objectives, and thus, reported the performance outcomes elsewhere. In looking at both participation and attendance, 63 syllabi (55%) reported that either was required or would be assessed (though in most cases, the participation and attendance requirement were not specified in the objectives). The aggregate data from the Syllabus Information Checklist indicated that of these 63 syllabi, 57 considered participation (only) in the grading assessment. However, 26, or less than half of these syllabi specified the way this would be assessed. In other words, though the syllabus does explain “what” the student should do, it fails to explain “how” and “to what extent” they would need to perform to reach an acceptable level.

Another reason, as an extension of the first, can be attributed to the fact that the College of Education does not specify a format for the way in which syllabi are written, and instructors are free to decide what components will be included in the syllabus and how this will be implemented. This may further explain the variability in the section names. As a result, “course goals” could be indicative of something different from “course objectives,” depending on the instructor.

Kaufman (2000) states, “any time you want to get results and be able to prove that the results have been delivered, you prepare measurable objectives” (p. 24). However, the results of this research indicate that the majority of objective are non-measurable or contain administrative outcomes. With no systematic method of addressing objectives, there is no requirement for instructors to design their curriculum around the Taxonomy or to focus on writing measurable learning outcomes. However, this puts into question the purpose of stating objectives in a syllabus if they do not help students clarify expected learning outcomes.

### **Alignment of Learning Outcomes**

An in-depth analysis aligning classification levels of objectives with levels of lesson activities and assessment guidelines was not possible due to the nature of the research. Such a discussion would assume that all objectives produced a measurable outcome. Furthermore, this would require, first, a clear indication of which objectives corresponded to which lesson activities and assessment procedures, and second,

knowledge of assessment procedures such as the type of questions being asked on quizzes and tests or of the levels at which the assessments were conducted. Nonetheless, the collected data revealed inconsistencies in the way the syllabi connected the objectives with the activities and assessment measures.

The initial analysis of the lesson activities indicated that objectives corresponded to 40% of the activities. However, this estimate was not as straight forward as initially anticipated because many of the objectives were vague (and included numerous learning outcomes), non-measurable, or administrative objectives. In many cases, the correlation was determined merely by connecting identifiable keywords or activity names, resulting in the researcher having to make assumptions about which objectives corresponded to which of the lesson activities.

A more precise indicator was found in the results from the Syllabus Information Checklist which reported that only 12 syllabi (10.5%) explicitly stated which lesson activities corresponded to the objectives. To fulfill this requirement, every objective had to be aligned to every lesson activity clearly. Unfortunately, a further attempt to compare alignment of classification levels based on Bloom's Taxonomy was not possible, as almost half of the objectives were not classifiable.

The lack of clarity in assessing the lesson activities made it increasingly difficult to find assessment guidelines that directly corresponded to the objectives. Although the analysis of the lesson activities and assessment data reported that objectives corresponded to 37% of the assessment guidelines, and the Syllabus Information Checklist indicated that 66 syllabi aligned activities and assessment procedures in the same section, because rubrics or guidelines were provided for only 12 syllabi, it was almost impossible to make a generalization about whether or not learning outcomes presented in the objectives and the assessment measures were being addressed at the same levels.

The literature describes the importance of course syllabi as a communication tool to improve guidance and minimize tension and conflict between the instructor and the students (Thompson, 2007; Ludwig, Bentz, and Fynewever, 2011). As stated earlier, objectives corresponded to all lesson activities in 12 syllabi. A notable observation can be made of the 18 syllabi in the same checklist category, which were marked as somewhat clear or somewhat true. These were syllabi that did not state how lesson activities directly corresponded to course objectives, but clearly indicated which state or professional standards were being assessed as a result of the activity. This is an important consideration that may, first, provide an explanation for why objectives have not been systematically aligned to the rest of the syllabus, and second, suggest that objectives are written for a primary target audience other than the students.

This phenomenon may be due in part to the growing emphasis on state mandated performance reporting that has led to decisions about funding through assessment and accountability in public institutions of higher education (Burke, 2001, Schmidt, 2002). From the 1990s, performance indicators have become widely used to improve system

efficiency and measuring specific outcome results (Gaither, 1997). Thus, accrediting bodies and policy makers have analyzed syllabi to assess the appropriation of funding based on the results. While this may be beneficial to administrators and policymakers in decision making, at the teaching and learning level, there is a need to ensure that the objectives stated in the syllabi primarily serve to facilitate effective and efficient learning for students through a clear communication of the performance that is expected from the learners of the class.

### **IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In this study, the objectives, activities, and assessment were examined and analyzed to compare the trends in course syllabi among the College of Education courses. The results indicate that there is a need for much improvement in clarifying the course objectives. A suggestion given by Becker and Calhoon (1999) states that when writing syllabi, instructors should place information that they attend to most, first, however, perhaps the reason why students do not attend to the course objectives is a result of years of experience in reading those objectives that fail to adequately provide clear outcomes of the course.

There are two recommendations for future study. In light of the growing popularity of learner-centered learning environments and performance based assessment, the first recommendation is to analyze the gap between the needs of the learner with respect to what is currently provided by the syllabi. As an extension of the first, the second recommendation is to conduct a qualitative study that extracts unique cases of syllabi, identifying the key elements that facilitate or interfere with the learning outcome, and exploring how the objectives can be structured in its relationship to learning activities and assessment procedures in a way that maximizes the needs of the learners.

### **REFERENCES**

- Anderson, L. W. et al. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives abridged edition*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Bataineh, R. F., & Zghoul, L. H. (2006). Jordanian TEFL graduate students' use of critical thinking skills (as measured by the Cornell Critical Thinking Test, Level Z). *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(1), 33-50.
- Becker, A. H., & Calhoon, S. K. (1999). What introductory psychology students attend to on a course syllabus. *Teaching of Psychology*, 26(1), 6-11.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, The classification of educational goals, Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Burke, J. C. (2001). Accountability, reporting, and performance: Why haven't they made more difference? Keynote Address presented at the 39th Annual Conference for Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges. Arrowhead, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED470462).

- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2009). *The systematic design of instruction*. (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Gaither, G. H. (1997). Performance indicator systems as instruments for accountability and assessment. *Assessment Update*, 9(1), 1-2, 14-15.
- Kaufman, R. (2000). *Mega planning: Practical tools for organizational success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ludwig, M. A., Bentz, A. E., & Fynewever, H. (2011). Your syllabus should set the stage for assesment for learning. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 40(4), 20-23.
- Mager, R. F. (1984). *Preparing instructional objectives*. (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: David S. Lake.
- Mager, R. F. (1997). *Preparing instructional objectives*. (3rd ed.). Atlanta, GA: CEP Press.
- Marzano, R. J., & Kendall, J. S. (2007). *The new taxonomy of educational objectives*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., & Kemp, J. E. (2004). *Designing effective instruction*. (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nentl, N., & Zietlow, R. (2008). Using Bloom's Taxonomy to teach critical thinking skills to business students. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 15(1/2), 159-172.
- Noble, T. (2004). Integrating the revised Bloom's Taxonomy with multiple intelligences: A planning tool for curriculum differentiation. *Teachers College Record*, 106(1), 193-211.
- Pappas, E., Pierrakos, O., & Nagel, R. (2013). Using Bloom's Taxonomy to teach sustainability in multiple contexts. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 48, 54-64. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.09.039
- Rudd, R. D. (2007). Defining critical thinking. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 82(7), 46-49.
- Schmidt, P. (2002). Most states tie aid to performance, despite little proof that it works. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(24), 20-A22.
- Swart, A. J. (2010). Evaluation of final examination papers in engineering: A case study using Bloom's Taxonomy. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 53(2), 257-264.
- Thompson, B. (2007). The syllabus as a communciation document: Constructing and presenting the syllabus. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 54-71. doi:
- Veeravagu, J., Muthusamy, C., & Marimuthu, R. (2010). Using Bloom's Taxonomy to gauge students' reading comprehension performance. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(3), 205-212.
- Zohar, A., & Dori, Y. J. (2003). Higher order thinking skills and low-achieving students: Are they mutually exclusive? *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 12(2), 145-181.
- Zohar, A., & Schwartz, N. (2005). Assessing teachers' pedagogical knowledge in the context of teaching higher-order thinking. *International Journal of Science Education*, 27(13), 1595-1620.
- Zygmunt, D., & Schaefer, K. (2006). Assessing the critical thinking skills of faculty: What do the findings mean for nursing education? *Educational Perspectives*, 27(5), 260-268.

#### Turkish Abstract

**Öğretim Amaçlarında Trendleri Yeniden Düşünmek: Yükseköğretimde Değerlendirme ve Aktivitelerle Amaçların Düzenlemesinin Belirlenmesi-Bir Durum Çalışması**

Bu çalışma eğitsel amaçlardaki trendleri belirlemek için yükseköğretim seviyesindeki müfredatlarını belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. ABD'deki bir Midwest öğretmen eğitimi kurumunda yürütülen derslerin 114 bölümünden 714 amacın sınıflandırılması için Bloom Taxonomisinden ve çeşitli stratejik modelden yararlanılmıştır. 1229 fiil ve fiil öbeği Taxonomiye göre sınıflandırılmış ve ölçülebilir ve ölçülemez öğrenme çıktıları olarak sınıflandırmanın yanında fiiller daha yüksek ve daha alçak sıralama olarak sınıflandırılmıştır. Bulgular öğrenme çıktılarının amaçlarının üst basamak beceri gerektiren amaçlar olmalarına rağmen, müfredatın dersin beklenen çıktıları konusunda yeterli bilgi vermediğini göstermiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Öğretim tasarımı, amaçlar, Bloom Taxonomisi, müfredat, üst basamak beceri

### French Abstract

#### Repenser les Tendances dans les Objectifs Pédagogiques: Exploration de l'Alignement d'Objectifs avec Activités et Évaluation dans Enseignement supérieur - une Étude de Cas

Cette étude a exploré l'enseignement supérieur nivellent syllabi pour identifier des tendances dans des objectifs éducatifs. La taxonomie de Bloom et des modèles stratégiques divers ont été utilisés pour classifier 714 objectifs de 114 sections de cours administrés par une institution d'enseignement de professeur du Midwest aux États-Unis. 1229 verbes et des expressions de verbe ont été classifiés par la Taxonomie et différenciés entre des verbes plus haut et plus bas ordonnés aussi bien que measurable et non-measurable l'apprentissage de résultats. Les résultats ont indiqué qu'en apprenant des résultats les objectifs sont suggestifs de compétences plus haut ordonnées bien que le syllabi ne fournisse pas en juste proportion d'informations sur les résultats attendus du cours.

**Mots-clés:** Conception d'instruction; objectifs; la taxonomie de Bloom; programme; plus haut compétence d'ordre

### Arabic Abstract

إعادة التفكير في اتجاهات الأهداف التعليمية: استكشاف مواءمة الأهداف مع الأنشطة والقياس والتقويم في التعليم العالي - دراسة حالة

استكشفت هذه الدراسة مناهج أعلى مستوى التعليم في تحديد الاتجاهات في الأهداف التعليمية. واستخدمت Bloom's Taxonomy والنماذج الاستراتيجية المختلفة لتصنيف 714 أهداف من 114 المقاطع من الدورات تدار من خلال مؤسسة التعليم المعلم الغرب الأوسط في الولايات المتحدة. تم تصنيف 1229 الأفعال والعبارات الفعل من خلال Taxonomy والتقريب بين أعلى وأسفل الأفعال الأمر وكذلك قابلة للقياس وغير قابلة للقياس نتيجة التعلم. أشارت النتائج إلى أنه على الرغم من نتائج التعلم أهداف هي موحية من المهارات العليا أمر على الرغم من أن المناهج الدراسية لا توفر بشكل كاف من المعلومات حول النتائج المتوقعة من الدورة.

الكلمات المهمة: التصميم التعليمي؛ الأهداف؛ Bloom's Taxonomy؛ المنهج؛ ترتيب أعلى مهارة.