# DECLARATION

I, Patricia Mambwe, hereby declare that the study titled	"Knowledge and use of Bloom's
hierarchy of cognitive levels of educational objectives	in setting examinations by nurse
educators in Lusaka and Eastern provinces" is from my ow	n hard work. It is being submitted
for a degree of Masters in Nursing Sciences at the Univ	ersity of Zambia. It has not been
submitted for any other purpose. All sources that have	been used or quoted have been
indicated and acknowledged by means of complete reference	ces.
Signature	Date

# Copyright © 2015 by Patricia Mambwe.

All rights reserved. Written permission must be secured from the author to use or reproduce any part of the dissertation.

## CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

This Dissertation for Patricia Mambwe is approved as fulfilling the requirements for the award of a Masters Degree in Nursing Sciences from the University of Zambia.

Examiner's Signature:	Date:
Examiner's Signature:	Date:
Examiner's Signature:	Date:
Head of Department Names:	
Signature:	
Data	

#### **ABSTRACT**

The use of Bloom's hierarchy of cognitive levels of educational objectives as a tool for classroom assessments is rapidly increasing; therefore Nurse Educators' knowledge of the tool is vital (De Young, 2009; Kim, et al., 2012; Cook, 2013; Agbedia and Ogbe, 2014).

The prime objective of this study was to investigate nurse educators' knowledge of Bloom's hierarchy of cognitive levels of educational objectives and whether they use it when preparing test items for examinations.

A cross sectional study was conducted in nursing training schools in Lusaka and Eastern provinces of Zambia. The study sample comprised of 63 Nurse Educators who were selected using convenient sampling method and a total of 51 past examination question papers with 3,358 questions from all the levels of basic nursing programs were reviewed between 2011 and 2013. A self administered questionnaire was used to collect data from nurse educators while a checklist with cognitive levels of educational objectives was used to collect data from the past examination papers. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was used to analyse data. The Chi Square test was used to compare the proportions. A result yielding a P value of less than 5 percent was considered to be statistically significant.

The findings were that more than half (64%) of nurse educators had low knowledge on Bloom's hierarchy of cognitive levels of educational objectives. Majority (92%) of the respondents did not follow Bloom's hierarchy of cognitive levels while 8% followed it when preparing test items for examinations. The greater percentage (95%) of examination questions prepared by nurse educators were dominated by low order cognitive category (knowledge and comprehension). Only 5% of examination questions were prepared at higher order level (application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation).

The study also revealed that nursing schools had no standardized assessment guidelines to follow when preparing test items for examinations.

The study revealed that nurse educators did not have blue prints to act as a guide on the number of questions to prepare in each level of cognitive domain and test items/examination questions were not reviewed by either peers or any committee before being administered to students. Results from the study indicated that (90%) of nurse educators assented that Continuing Professional Development meetings on assessment techniques were not conducted in the schools of nursing.

The study found a significant relationship between knowledge and usage of Bloom's

hierarchy of cognitive levels of educational objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommended that the General Nursing Council of Zambia should develop a blue

print for examinations at each level of training and reinforce supervision on the preparation of

test items across the cognitive domain. Special attention should also be given to the

alignment of teaching and assessment in such a way that the level of complexity increases as

students progress through the programme. Prior to test administration, a review process

should be implemented to evaluate, eliminate item writing flaws, offer suggestions and

encourage appropriateness of cognitive levels of educational objectives within the

examination paper. This will promote quality in nursing education and uphold high standards

of students' achievement. Continuing Professional Development meetings, workshops and

seminars on questioning techniques using Bloom's hierarchy of cognitive levels of

educational objectives should be developed and made mandatory for all academic staff in all

nursing schools. This will improve quality in nursing education and keep all nurse educators

abreast with the current information.

Key words: Knowledge, Bloom's hierarchy, cognitive levels, educational objectives,

Setting examinations, Nurse Educators

٧

### **DEDICATION**

This Dissertation is dedicated to the following people. Firstly, it is dedicated to my lovely mother, Ruth, who encouraged me to further my studies and remained at my side supporting my journey in every way possible.

Secondly, to my sisters, Peggy, Precious, Priscilla and my brother Big, for their unwavering support and love. I hope and trust that this work will inspire them to continue valuing education and work extra hard in life.

Thirdly, to my beloved husband and friend, Jordan, for unconditional love, encouragement and support throughout the stages of this study.

Lastly, to my best friend, late Inonge Mubialelwa, for her love and encouragement. M.H.S.R.I.P

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I thank my Almighty God for good health, strength, guidance and perseverance throughout this involving study. Without God, 'all is Vanity' (Ecclesiastes 2 verse 11).

My deepest heartfelt gratitude goes to my supervisor, Dr Catherine Ngoma, for her patience, enthusiasm, guidance and dedicating her precious time to supervise this dissertation. She kept on monitoring my progress so that my interest, energies and goals are directed in the intended direction. May God richly bless you.

I also extend my genuine acknowledgement and appreciation to all nurse educators who participated in this study for their time and cooperation. My special tribute further goes to senior tutors - academic in all nursing schools under study for all their support and assistance to access the past examination question papers.

My sincere appreciation also goes to all my friends for believing in me and for giving me a drive to move on with my research work. God bless you all. Special thanks go to our family friend, Albert Simasiku, for his tireless support. God bless you abundantly.

A special word of thanks to my beloved mother "mama", husband and sisters who joined hands with me in prayer for my success. I thank them for the hardship they had to go through in my absence. I also thank them for being with me through hard times of sleepless nights, physical and emotional breakdowns. No words or expression could articulate how much their contribution to my academic life is valued.

My special tribute also goes to Bamalete Lutheran School of Nursing Staff for their support and encouragement. Indeed distance did not separate us.

To those I have not mentioned here, I say thank you very much and may God richly bless you all.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGES
Declaration	i
Copyright	ii
Certificate of approval	iii
Abstract	iv
Dedication	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Table of content	ix
List of tables	xii
List of figures	xiii
List of abbreviations	xv
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Back ground	2
1.2 Statement of the problem	8
1.3 Factors influencing knowledge and usage	9
1.4 Theoretical frame work	14
1.5 Rationale/Justification	15
1.6 Significance of the study	16
1.7 Research question	17
1.8 Objectives of the study	
1.8.1 General objective	17
1.8.2 Specific objectives	17
1.9 Hypothesis	18
1.10 Conceptual Definitions	18
1.11 Operational Definitions	19
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.0 Review of related Literature	23
2.1 Introduction	23
2.2 Use of Bloom's taxonomy	23
2.3 Knowledge	25
2.4 Time	26

2.5 Orientation of nurse educators in examination	26
setting	
2.6 Standardized guidelines	27
2.7 Educators' attitude	27
2.8 Work load	28
2.9 Conclusion	28
CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY	
3.0 Research methodology	29
3.1 Introduction	29
3.2 Research Approach	29
3.3 Research design	29
3.4 Research setting	29
3.5 Study population	30
3.5.1 Target population	30
3.6. Inclusion criteria	30
3.6.1 Exclusion criteria	31
3.7 Sampling method	31
3.8 Sample size determination	32
3.9 Data collection tools	34
3.9.3 Validity of data collecting tools	36
3.9.4 Reliability of data collecting tools	36
3.10 Data collection techniques	36
3.11 Pre – testing of the research instrument	38
3.12 Ethical consideration	38
3.13 Data analysis and presentation	39
CHAPTER FOUR - PRESENTATION OF	
THE RESEARCH FINDINGS	
4.0 Data analysis and presentation	40
4.1 Introduction	40
4.2 Presentation of data from questionnaires	40
4.2.1 <b>Section A:</b> Socio demographic data of	40
respondents	
4.2.2 <b>Section B:</b> Knowledge levels on Blooms'	44
Taxonomy	

levels of educational objectives when setting examinations 4.2.3.1 Use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 4.2.3.2 Follows standardized guidelines 5.2 Follows standardized guidelines 5.3 Nurse educators' work load 5.4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations 4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations 4.3.1 Examination of data from past examination papers 4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A 4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B 4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution G 4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions 4.4 Associations among variables 6.1 Introduction 6.2 Demographic information 6.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives 6.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators 6.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 6.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 6.6 Conclusion 6.0 Implications to nursing 7.0 Recommendations 6.0 Limitations of the study 9.0 Dissemination and utilization of finings	4.2.3 <b>Section C:</b> Bloom's Hierarchy of cognitive	49
4.2.3.1 Use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 4.2.3.2 Follows standardized guidelines 5.1 4.2.3.3 Nurse educators' work load 5.6 4.2.3.4 Time taken to prepare test items 5.7 4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations 4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers 4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A 4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B 4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C 4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions 4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Demographic information 5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives 5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators 5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 5.6 Conclusion 102 6.0 Implications to nursing 103 7.0 Recommendations 106 8.0 Limitations of the study 108	levels of educational objectives when setting	
objectives 4.2.3.2 Follows standardized guidelines 51 4.2.3.3 Nurse educators' work load 56 4.2.3.4 Time taken to prepare test items 57 4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations 4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers 4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A 4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B 4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C 4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions 4.4 Associations among variables CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Demographic information Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives 5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators 5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 5.6 Conclusion 6.0 Implications to nursing 103 7.0 Recommendations 106 8.0 Limitations of the study	examinations	
4.2.3.2 Follows standardized guidelines 51 4.2.3.3 Nurse educators' work load 56 4.2.3.4 Time taken to prepare test items 57 4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations 4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers 4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A 4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B 4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C 4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions 4.4 Associations among variables CHAPTER FIVE — DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Demographic information 5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives 5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators 5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 5.6 Conclusion 6.0 Implications to nursing 7.0 Recommendations 8.0 Limitations of the study 108	4.2.3.1 Use of cognitive levels of educational	49
4.2.3.3 Nurse educators' work load 4.2.3.4 Time taken to prepare test items 57 4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations 4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers 4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A 4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B 4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C 4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions 4.4 Associations among variables CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 5.1 Introduction 5.2 Demographic information 5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives 5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators 5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 5.6 Conclusion 6.0 Implications to nursing 7.0 Recommendations 8.0 Limitations of the study	objectives	
4.2.3.4 Time taken to prepare test items  4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations  4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers  4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A  4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  8.6  5.2 Demographic information  8.7  8.8  8.9  8.9  8.9  8.9  8.9  8.9	4.2.3.2 Follows standardized guidelines	51
4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting examinations  4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers  4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A  4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study	4.2.3.3 Nurse educators' work load	56
examinations  4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers  4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A  4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  8.0 Limitations of the study	4.2.3.4 Time taken to prepare test items	57
4.3 Presentation of data from past examination papers  4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A  4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  8.0 Limitations of the study	4.2.3.5 Use of taxonomies when setting	59
papers  4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A  4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  8.0 Limitations of the study  6.8 Institution	examinations	
4.3.1 Examination question papers from Institution A  4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  8.0 Limitations of the study  6.8 Implications to the study  6.8 Implications of the study	4.3 Presentation of data from past examination	62
Institution A  4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  8.0 Limitations of the study  68  68  67  77  77  77  78  86  87  87	papers	
4.3.2 Examination question papers from Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  80  81  82  84  85  86  87  89  89  89  60  60  60  60  60  60  60  60  60  6	4.3.1 Examination question papers from	63
Institution B  4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  81  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction 86  5.2 Demographic information 86  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion 102  6.0 Implications to nursing 103  7.0 Recommendations 106  8.0 Limitations of the study 108	Institution A	
4.3.3 Examination question papers from Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction 86  5.2 Demographic information 86  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion 102  6.0 Implications to nursing 103  7.0 Recommendations 106  8.0 Limitations of the study 108	4.3.2 Examination question papers from	68
Institution C  4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  86  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  8.1 Limitations of the study  77  77  77  77  77  77  77  77  77	Institution B	
4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  86  5.2 Demographic information  87  Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  102  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study	4.3.3 Examination question papers from	73
from 3 institutions  4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction  5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  102  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study	Institution C	
4.4 Associations among variables  CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction 86  5.2 Demographic information 86  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion 102  6.0 Implications to nursing 103  7.0 Recommendations 106  8.0 Limitations of the study 108	4.3.4 Summation of cognitive levels	77
CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS  5.1 Introduction 86 5.2 Demographic information 86 5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives 5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators 5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 5.6 Conclusion 102 6.0 Implications to nursing 103 7.0 Recommendations 106 8.0 Limitations of the study 108	from 3 institutions	
5.1 Introduction 86 5.2 Demographic information 86 5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on 87 Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives 5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators 5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives 5.6 Conclusion 102 6.0 Implications to nursing 103 7.0 Recommendations 106 8.0 Limitations of the study 108	4.4 Associations among variables	81
5.1 Introduction 86  5.2 Demographic information 86  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion 102  6.0 Implications to nursing 103  7.0 Recommendations 106  8.0 Limitations of the study 108	CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION OF	
5.2 Demographic information  5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  102  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study	FINDINGS	
5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  102  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study	5.1 Introduction	86
Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives  5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study	5.2 Demographic information	86
5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  102  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study	5.3 Nurse educators' knowledge levels on	87
examination papers by nurse educators  5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study  108	Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives	
5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study  108	5.4 Levels of cognitive domain assessed in	89
cognitive levels of educational objectives  5.6 Conclusion  6.0 Implications to nursing  7.0 Recommendations  106  8.0 Limitations of the study  108	examination papers by nurse educators	
5.6 Conclusion 102 6.0 Implications to nursing 103 7.0 Recommendations 106 8.0 Limitations of the study 108	5.5 Relationship between knowledge and use of	98
6.0 Implications to nursing 103 7.0 Recommendations 106 8.0 Limitations of the study 108	cognitive levels of educational objectives	
7.0 Recommendations 106 8.0 Limitations of the study 108	5.6 Conclusion	102
8.0 Limitations of the study 108	6.0 Implications to nursing	103
	7.0 Recommendations	106
9.0 Dissemination and utilization of finings 108	8.0 Limitations of the study	108

References	109
APPENDICES	
Appendix I: Information sheet for respondents	117
Appendix II: informed consent form	119
Appendix III: Budget	120
Appendix IV: Gantt Chart	122
Appendix V: Data collection tool	124
(questionnaire)	
Appendix VI: Requesting permission to use	134
research instrument	
Appendix VII: Template for collecting data on	135
Cognitive levels	
Appendix VIII: Letters requesting to use schools	136
of nursing as research sites	
Appendix IX: Letters requesting to use schools	139
of nursing as pilot study sites	
Appendix X: Letter to ERESC committee	140
Appendix XI: Action verbs of Bloom's	142
taxonomy	

# LIST OF TABLES

## **PAGE NUMBER**

Table 2: composition of examination question Papers from 2011 to 2013  Table 3: Compilation of peer reviewed test items  Table 4: Summation of cognitive levels and Levels of complexity in examination Papers of institution A  Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in students	Table 1: Variables, cut off points, indicators	21
Papers from 2011 to 2013  Table 3: Compilation of peer reviewed test items  Table 4: Summation of cognitive levels and Levels of complexity in examination Papers of institution A  Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in		
Table 3: Compilation of peer reviewed test items  Table 4: Summation of cognitive levels and Levels of complexity in examination Papers of institution A  Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 2: composition of examination question	33
Table 4: Summation of cognitive levels and Levels of complexity in examination Papers of institution A  Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Papers from 2011 to 2013	
Levels of complexity in examination Papers of institution A  Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 3: Compilation of peer reviewed test items	57
Papers of institution A  Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 4: Summation of cognitive levels and	66
Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Levels of complexity in examination	
Year 1 papers  Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Papers of institution A	
Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B: Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 5: Cognitive levels used in institution B:	67
Year 2 papers – intermediate exams  Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Year 1 papers	
Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 6: Cognitive levels used in institution B:	68
Papers of institution B  Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Year 2 papers – intermediate exams	
Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C: year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 7: Summation of cognitive levels	70
year 1 papers  Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Papers of institution B	
Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 8: Cognitive levels used in institution C:	73
Papers of institution C  Table 10: Action Verbs  77  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	year 1 papers	
Table 10: Action Verbs  Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 9: Summation of cognitive levels	75
Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Papers of institution C	
Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing cognitive domain  Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in		
Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 10: Action Verbs	77
Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 11: Follow taxonomies and knowing	81
words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	cognitive domain	
words used to classify test questions in lowest levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in		
levels of cognitive domains  Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	Table 12: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of	82
Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	words used to classify test questions in lowest	
cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	levels of cognitive domains	
	Table 13: Use of taxonomies and knowledge of	83
students	cognitive levels promoting critical thinking in	
	students	

## LIST OF FIGURES

## **PAGE NUMBER**

Figure 1: changes in Bloom's taxonomy	6
Figure 2: Problem analysis diagram	13
Figure 3: Product model	14
Figure 4: Respondents' gender	41
Figure 5: Respondents' ages	41
Figure 6: Respondents' level of qualification	42
Figure 7: Respondents' years of experience	43
Figure 8: Institution where highest qualification	44
was attained from.	
Figure 9: Definition of Bloom's taxonomy	45
Figure 10: Domains of Bloom's hierarchy	45
Figure 11: Levels of cognitive domain	46
Figure 12: Words used to classify lowest level of	47
cognitive domain	
Figure 13: Cognitive levels of educational	48
Objectives promoting critical	
thinking	
Figure 14: Nurse educators' knowledge levels on	49
Bloom's taxonomy	
Figure 15: Following cognitive levels when	50
Setting examinations	
Figure 16: Importance of Bloom's hierarchy of	49
Cognitive levels when setting examinations	
Figure 17: Following standardized guidelines when	51
Setting examinations	
Figure 18: Peer review of test items	52
Figure 19: Availability of blue print	52
Figure 20: Use of blue print	53
Figure 21: Percentage of questions set for	54
each cognitive category	
Figure 22: CPD meetings on assessment	55
techniques	
Figure 23: Educator – student ratio	56
Figure 24: Team test item preparation	57

Figure 25: Duration at which test items are	58
prepared	
Figure 26: Follow taxonomies when asking	59
questions	
Figure 27: How often taxonomies are used	60
Figure 28: Factors which affect nurse educators	61
Figure 29:Factors affecting usage of Blooms	61
Figure 30: Cognitive Levels used in Institution A:	63
Year 1 papers	
Figure 31: Cognitive Levels used in Institution A:	65
Year 2 papers	
Figure 32: Cognitive Levels used in Institution A:	66
Year 3 Papers	
Figure 33: Institution B: Year 2: Hospital Mock	70
Examinations	
Figure 34: Cognitive Levels used for Institution	73
C: Year 1 Papers	
Figure 35: Cognitive Levels used in Institution C:	75
Year 2, Hospital Mock Examinations	
Figure 36: Summation of cognitive levels of examination questions (2011-2013) in schools of nursing of Eastern and Lusaka provinces	78
Figure 37: Use of taxonomies when asking	81
questions and knowledge of domains of Bloom's	
taxonomy	
	<u> </u>

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CPD: Continuous Professional Development

CBE: Community – Based Education

GNC: General Nursing Council of Zambia

ERESC: Research Ethics and Science Converge

MCQ: Multiple Choice Questions

NCSBN: National Council of State Boards of Nurses

NCLEX – RN: National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses

PBL: Problem Based Learning