

The Second Principle

The work of Leslie Owen Wilson, Ed. D.

- Creativity
 - Brainstorming
 - Characteristics of highly creative individuals
 - Levels of creativity
 - The Snowflake Model of Creativity
 - Children and Creativity
 - Characteristics of creative children
 - Killing or Fostering Creativity in Children
 - Creativity Essentials
 - Advice for Thinking Creatively
 - Blockages and Barriers to Creativity
 - On definitions of creativity
 - Sacred Rules of Creativity
 - Types of creative thinking
 - Criteria to Help Evaluate Creative Ideas
 - Entering a State of Flow
 - Finding your creative muse
 - Caring for Your Creative Muse
 - Forms of Creative Inspiration
 - Learn to Celebrate – Creatively
 - The importance of persistence to creativity
 - Using negative emotions to fuel creativity
- Homepage
 - Leslie's Blog
 - Poetry Corner — Poems about teaching and learning
 - Dressings
 - My Soul's Own Voice
 - The Unitary Child
 - Lessons of Another Kind
 - The Swirls
 - Into the Bend of Interwoven Time
 - One Finds Children
 - The Reductive Sum of One
 - Usage Policies and About Leslie
- Instructional Design
 - Beyond Behavioral Objectives
 - Creating Curriculum with Backwards Design
 - Curriculum Guide Rating Scale
 - Integrating Curriculum by Degrees
 - Lesson Plans and Teacher Resources
 - The Instructional Design/Curriculum Development Process
 - Three Domains of Learning – Cognitive, Affective, Psychomotor
 - Types of curriculum
 - Writing Curriculum – Aims, Goals, and Objectives
- Optimal Learning
 - Brainbased Education – An Overview
 - Emotional Intelligence – Educational Applications
 - Emotional Intelligence Highlights
 - Multiple Intelligence Indicators
 - Sternberg's Views on Intelligence

- The Eighth Intelligence – Naturalistic Intelligence
- The Four Types of Learning
- The Ninth Intelligence – Existential or Cosmic Smarts
- Using Brainbased Education
- Recommendations
 - Books on Brainbased Learning
 - Must Read Books
 - Some books on creativity
- Teaching Essentials
 - A dozen important brain based concepts
 - Anderson and Krathwohl – Bloom’s Taxonomy Revised
 - Five Basic Types of Questions
 - Making Instructional Decisions
 - Models of Teaching
 - Madeline Hunter Lesson Plan Model
 - Selection, Detection, Connection – A Self-directed Teaching Model
 - Personalizing Learning
 - Teaching Today’s Students
 - What are Essential Questions?

Navigation

The second principle of magic:
 “Things which have once been in contact with each other
 continue to act on each other at a distance even
 after the physical contact has been severed
 James Frazer

Three Domains of Learning – Cognitive, Affective, Psychomotor

©Leslie Owen Wilson all rights reserved [Contact Leslie](#)

Three domains of learning – What are the differences between the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor taxonomies?

There are three main domains of learning and all teachers should know about them and use them to construct lessons. These domains are cognitive (thinking), affective (emotion/feeling), and psychomotor (physical/kinesthetic). Each domain on this page has a taxonomy associated with it. Taxonomy is simply a word for a classification. All of the taxonomies below are arranged so that they proceed from the simplest to more complex levels. The ones discussed here are usually attributed to their primary author, even though the actual development



may have had many authors in its formal, complete citation.

- Benjamin Bloom (Cognitive Domain),
- David Krathwohl (Affective Domain), and
- Anita Harrow (Psychomotor Domain).

It is interesting to note that even though the taxonomy associated with cognition is commonly referred to as Bloom's Taxonomy, David Krathwohl was also one of the original authors in creating this work. This will become important when you look at the 2001 revisions to this taxonomy.

Many veteran teachers are unaware that the cognitive/thinking domain, again commonly known as Bloom's Taxonomy and originally published in 1956, had major revisions in 2000/01. While I have included the original cognitive one, I have also attached it to the newly revised version so that users can see the differences. The **newer version of Bloom's Taxonomy** of Learning has a number of added features that are very useful to educators in constructing optimal learning experiences.

Additionally, when possible, teachers should attempt to construct more **holistic lessons** by using all 3 domains in learning tasks. This diversity helps to create more well-rounded learning experiences and meets a number of learning styles and learning modalities, plus it creates more neural networks and pathways aiding recall.

The Original Cognitive or Thinking Domain –

Based on the 1956 work, *The Handbook I-Cognitive Domain*, behavioral objectives are divided into subsets. These subsets were arranged into a taxonomy and listed according to the cognitive difficulty, simpler to more complex forms. As stated earlier it has been commonly known as Bloom's Taxonomy since 1956. In 2000-01 revisions to this taxonomy were spearheaded by one of Bloom's former students, Lorin Anderson, and one of his original partners in defining the cognitive domain, David Krathwohl. Please see my page entitled **Anderson and Krathwohl – Bloom's Taxonomy Revised** for further details.

Remember while it is good to understand the history of the older version of the domain, the newer version has a number of strong advantages that make it a better choice for planning instruction today. One of the major changes that has occurred between the old and newer updated version is that **the two highest forms of cognition have been reversed**.

Additional Resources: A wonderfully succinct and comprehensive overview of both taxonomies is provided by Mary Forehand at the University of Georgia in a Wikipedia type format, see **Bloom's taxonomy**. Plus, there are many different types of graphics cleverly depicting the new versions that can be printed and readily used as everyday references during instructional planning. In a search engine like Google enter "revised Bloom's taxonomy" and view the "images" portion of the search to find many different types of colorful and useful graphics on this topic.

Taxonomies of the Cognitive Domain

Bloom's Taxonomy 1956

Anderson and Krathwohl's Taxonomy 2001

1. Knowledge: Remembering or retrieving previously learned material. Examples of verbs that relate to this function are:

| | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| know identify relate list | define recall memorize repeat | record name recognize acquire |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|

1. Remembering: Recognizing or recalling knowledge from memory. Remembering is when memory is used to produce definitions, facts, or lists, or recite or retrieve material.

2. Comprehension: The ability to grasp or construct meaning from material. Examples of verbs that relate to this function are:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| restate locate report recognize explain express | identify discuss describe discuss review infer | illustrate interpret draw represent differentiate conclude |
|---|--|---|

2. Understanding: Constructing meaning from different types of functions be they written or graphic messages activities like interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.

3. Application: The ability to use learned material, or to implement material in new and concrete situations. Examples of verbs that relate to this function are:

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| apply relate develop translate use operate | organize employ restructure interpret demonstrate illustrate | practice calculate show exhibit dramatize |
|--|--|---|

3. Applying: Carrying out or using a procedure through executing, or implementing. Applying related and refers to situations where learned material is used through products like models, presentations, interviews or simulations.

4. Analysis: The ability to break down or distinguish the parts of material into its components so that its organizational structure may be better understood. Examples of verbs that relate to this function are:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| analyze compare probe inquire examine contrast categorize | differentiate contrast investigate detect survey classify deduce | experiment scrutinize discover inspect dissect discriminate separate |
|--|---|---|

4. Analyzing: Breaking material or concepts into parts, determining how the parts relate or interrelate to one another or to an overall structure or purpose. Mental actions included in this function are differentiating, organizing, and attributing, as well as being able to distinguish between the components or parts. When one is analyzing he/she can illustrate this mental function by creating spreadsheets, surveys, charts, or diagrams, or graphic representations.

5. Synthesis: The ability to put parts together to form a coherent or unique new whole. Examples of verbs that relate to this function are:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| compose produce design assemble create prepare predict modify tell | plan invent formulate collect set up generalize document combine relate | propose develop arrange construct organize originate derive write propose |
|---|---|--|

5. Evaluating: Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing. Critiques, recommendations, and reports are some of the products that can be created to demonstrate the processes of evaluation. In the newer taxonomy evaluation comes before creating as it is often a necessary part of the precursory behavior before creating something.

6. Evaluation: The ability to judge, check, and even critique the value of material for a given purpose. Examples of verbs that relate to this function are:

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| judge assess compare evaluate conclude measure deduce | argue decide choose rate select estimate | validate consider appraise value criticize infer |
|--|---|--|

6. Creating: Putting elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganizing elements into a new pattern or structure through generating, planning, or producing. Creating requires users to put parts together in a new way or synthesize parts into something new and different a new form or product. This process is the most difficult mental function in the new taxonomy.

Table 1.1 – (Wilson, L.O. 2001) – Bloom vs. Anderson/Krathwohl revisions

The Affective or Feeling Domain:

Like cognitive objectives, affective objectives can also be divided into a hierarchy (according to Krathwohl). This area is concerned with feelings or emotions. Again, the taxonomy is arranged from simpler feelings to those that are more complex.

1. Receiving

This refers to the learner’s sensitivity to the existence of stimuli – awareness, willingness to receive, or selected attention.

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| feel sense capture experience | pursue attend perceive |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|

2. Responding

This refers to the learners’ active attention to stimuli and his/her motivation to learn – acquiescence, willing responses, or feelings of satisfaction.

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| conform allow cooperate | contribute enjoy satisfy |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|

3. Valuing

This refers to the learner’s beliefs and attitudes of worth – acceptance, preference, or commitment. An acceptance, preference, or commitment to a value.

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| believe seek justify | respect search persuade |
|----------------------|-------------------------|

4. Organization

This refers to the learner's internalization of values and beliefs involving (1) the conceptualization of values; and (2) the organization of a value system. As values or beliefs become internalized, the learner organizes them according to priority.

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| examine clarify systematize | create integrate |
|-----------------------------|------------------|

5. **Characterization** – the Internalization of values

This refers to the learner's highest of internalization and relates to behavior that reflects (1) a generalized set of values; and (2) a characterization or a philosophy about life. At this level the learner is capable of practicing and acting on their values or beliefs.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| internalize review conclude | resolve judge |
|-----------------------------|---------------|

Based on:

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S. and Masia, B. B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives, Book II. Affective domain. New York, NY. David McKay Company, Inc.

Note: As with all of the taxonomies, in labeling objectives using this domain **there has to be a very clear instructional intention for growth in this area specified in the learning objective(s)**. Folks in the sciences and in math often avoid including affective objectives stating that their areas are not emotional. However, any group work or cooperative exercise where department, or collaborative or cooperative skills are discussed, used, and emphasized qualifies as having the potential for affective growth. Additionally, if students are asked to challenge themselves with independently taking risks to develop and present a hypothesis and/or persuade others on drawn conclusions, or actively take an intellectual risk whereby they increase in self-confidence, these types of exercises also have the potential to be affective as well as a cognitive. Also, in areas of potential debate, where data allows students to draw conclusions about controversial topics or express opinions and feelings on those topics, this too can be tweaked so there is intentional affective growth. Since emotion draws both attention and channels strong residual memory, it behooves all dedicated and artful educators to include affective objectives, no matter what their discipline or area of study.

The Psychomotor or Kinesthetic Domain

Psychomotor objectives are those specific to discreet physical functions, reflex actions and interpretive movements. Traditionally, these types of objectives are concerned with the physically encoding of information, with movement and/or with activities where the gross and fine muscles are used for expressing or interpreting information or concepts. This area also refers to natural, autonomic responses or reflexes.

As stated earlier, to avoid confusion, if the activity is simply something that is physical **which supports another area** — affective or cognitive — term the objective **physical** rather than **psychomotor**. **Again, this goes to instructional intent**. A primary example of something physical which supports specific cognitive development and skills might be looking through a microscope and identifying and drawing cells. Here the instructional intent of this common scientific activity is not to develop specific skilled proficiency in microscope viewing or in reproducing cells through drawing. Usually the key intent in this activity is that a physical action supports or is a vehicle for cognitive growth and furthering recognition skills. The learner is using the physical action to achieve the cognitive objectives — identify, recognize, and differentiate varied types of cells.

If you are using a physical activity to support a cognitive or affective function, simply label it as something **physical** (labeling the objective as kinesthetic, haptic, or tactile is also acceptable) and avoid the term psychomotor. Labeling something **psychomotor** means there is a very clear educational intention for growth to occur in the psychomotor domain.

Certainly more complex learning objectives can be written so that they meld 2 or 3 domains. For instance, students can gain appreciation (an affective objective) for the culture or country of origin through conducting investigations or listening to stories while learning the dances from other countries. Learning dance steps would fall under “skilled movements” in the psychomotor domain.

(Terms in this area based on Anita Harrow’s taxonomy).

Reflex movements

Objectives at this level include reflexes that involve one segmental or reflexes of the spine and movements that may involve more than one segmented portion of the spine as intersegmental reflexes (e.g., involuntary muscle contraction). These movements are involuntary being either present at birth or emerging through maturation.

Fundamental movements

Objectives in this area refer to skills or movements or behaviors related to walking, running, jumping, pushing, pulling and manipulating. They are often components for more complex actions.

Perceptual abilities

Objectives in this area should address skills related to kinesthetic (bodily movements), visual, auditory, tactile (touch), or coordination abilities as they are related to the ability to take in information from the environment and react.

Physical abilities

Objectives in this area should be related to endurance, flexibility, agility, strength, reaction-response time or dexterity.

Skilled movements

Objectives in this area refer to skills and movements that must be learned for games, sports, dances, performances, or for the arts.

Nondiscursive communication

Objectives in this area refer to expressive movements through posture, gestures, facial expressions, and/or creative movements like those in mime or ballet. These movements refer to interpretative movements that communicate meaning without the aid of verbal commands or help.

Remember that the trick in effectively planning lessons — there has to be the intention for growth specifically in the selected domain area! Learning takes place in ALL 3 domains and wise teachers combine domains so that lessons and learning are more holistic and multidimensional.

The following **page** and **PPT AGO2** illustrate how you can use all three domains to create more holistic learning experiences.

Sources:

Anderson, L. W. and Krathwohl, D. R., et al (Eds.) (2001) *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Allyn & Bacon. Boston, MA (Pearson Education Group)

Bloom, B.S. and Krathwohl, D. R. (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, by a committee of college and university examiners. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. NY, NY: Longmans, Green

Harrow, A. (1972) *A Taxonomy of Psychomotor Domain: A Guide for Developing Behavioral Objectives*. New York: David McKay.

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., Masia, B.B. (1973). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, the Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.