

March 2019

Assessing History Students' Historical Skills in the Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana

Charles Adabo Oppong

University of Cape Coast, Ghana, coppong@ucc.edu.gh

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/the_councilor

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Economics Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Geography Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), [Pre-Elementary, Early Childhood, Kindergarten Teacher Education Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Oppong, Charles Adabo (2019) "Assessing History Students' Historical Skills in the Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana," *The Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies*: Vol. 80 : No. 1 , Article 3.

Available at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/the_councilor/vol80/iss1/3

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies by an authorized editor of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Assessing History Students' Historical Skills in the Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana

Cover Page Footnote

Arthur, C., & Bena, K. (2009). *Habits of mind across the curriculum: Practical and creative strategies for teachers*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Berg, L. B. (2004). *Qualitative Research Methods for social sciences*. New York: Omeyatyp Typograph Inc.

Betram, C. (2012). Exploring a historical gaze: A language of description for the practice of school history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 44(3), 429-442.

Britt, A., & Aglinskas, C. (2002). Improving students' ability to identify and use source information. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(4), 485-522.

Britt, M. A., Perfetti, C. A., & Van Dyke, J. A., & Gabrys, G. (2000). The sourcer's apprentice. A tool for document-supported history instruction. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history* (Pp. 437-470). New York: The New York University Press.

Drapper, R. J., Broomhead, P., Nokes, J. D., & Siebert, D. (2010). Supporting disciplinary literacies: (Re) imagining content and literacy instruction. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Reading Conference/ Literacy Research Association. December 2, 2010.

Fellman, S., & Rahikainen, M. (2012). *Historical knowledge: In quest of theory, method and evidence*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Gomez, C. J., & Miralles, P. (2015). *Pensar historiicamente o memorizar el pasado? La e evaluacion de los contenidos historicos en la educacion obligatoria en Espana*. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 52, 52-68.

Gomez, C. J., Cozar, R., & Miralles, P. (2014). *La ensenanza de la historia y el analisis de libros de texto. Construccion de identidades y iesarrollo de competencias*. *Ensayos*, 29(1), 1-25.

Hick, D. D., Doolittle, P., & Lee, J. (2004). Social studies teachers' use of classroom-based and web-based historical primary sources. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 32, 213-247.

Kvande, L., & Naastad, N. (2013). *Hvaskalvi med historie? Historiedidaktikk i teoriogpraksis*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Lee, P. (1983). *History teaching and philosophy of history*. *History and Theory*, 22, 19- 49.

Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students age 7-14. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.) *knowing, teaching, and learning history. National and international perspectives* (pp. 199-222). New York: New York University Press.

Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically, educating students for the Twenty-First century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Miles, M., & Huberman A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded resource book*. London: SAGE Publishers.

Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 52, 96-107.

Monte- Sano, C. (2011). Beyond reading comprehension and summary: Learning to read and write in history by focusing on evidence, perspective, and interpretation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(2), 212-249

Oppong, C. A. (2012). *Teaching and learning of history: An evaluation in the senior high schools in the Central Regions of Ghana*. Saarbruken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Perfetti, C. A., Britt, M. A., Rouet, J-F., Georgi, M. C., & Mason, R. A. (1994). How students use texts to learn and reason about historical uncertainty. In Carretero M., Voss J. M (Eds.), *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and social sciences* (pp.257-283). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Reisman, A., & Wineburg, S. (2012). Ways of knowing and the history classroom: Supporting disciplinary discussion and reasoning about text. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio, & M. Rodriguez- Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp.171-188). Charlotte, NC: Information and Age Publishing.

Rentalla, J. (2012). How Finnish adolescent understand history: Disciplinary thinking in history and its assessment among 16-year-old Finns. *Education Sciences*, 2(4), 193-207. Retrieved June 10, 2014, from <http://www.mdpi. Com/2227-7102/2/4/193>.

Robinson, A. C. (1959). *Athens in the age of pericles*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Rosenlund, D. (2011).

AttHanteraHistoriaMedet Toga Stangt: Samtammighet MellanHistoria A OchLararesProvOchUppgifter. LundsUniversitetOch Malmo Hogskola: ForskarskolaniHistoriaOchHistoriedidakti. Rouet, J. F., Favart, M., Britt, M. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1997). Studying and using multiple documents in history: Effects of discipline expertise. *Cognition and Instruction*, 15, 85-106. Salvatori, M. R. (2002). The scholarship of teaching: Beyond the anecdotal. *Pedagogy*2(3), 297-310 Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). The big six. Historical thinking concepts. Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd. Seixas, P. (2006). Benchmark of historical thinking: A framework for assessment in Canada. Canada: Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness. Retrieved from [http //historicalthinking. Ca/sites/default/files/Framework. Benchmark. Pdf](http://historicalthinking.ca/sites/default/files/Framework.Benchmark.Pdf) Seixas, P., & Peck, C. (2004). Teaching historical thinking. In A. Sears & I. wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 109-117). Vancouver, Canada: Pacific Educational Press. Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content area literacy. *Harvard Education Review*,78, 40-59. Trepatt, C., & Comes, P. (2006). El tiepo y elespacioen la didactica de las cienciasociales. Barcelona: ICE/Grao. VanSledright, B. (2013). *Assessing historical thinking and understanding. Innovative designs for new standards.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge. Wineburg, S., & Monte- Sano, C. (2011). *Reading like historian: Teaching literacy in middle and high school history classrooms.* New York: Teachers College Press. Wineburg, S. (1998). *Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert study in the interpretation of historical texts.* *Cognitive Science*,22, 319- 346. Wineburg, S. (1994). The cognitive representation of historical texts. In G. Leinhardt, I. L. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in history* (pp. 85-136). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Wineburg, S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 73-87. Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 495- 519.

History curricula seek to equip students with the skills needed to practice history by explicitly stressing the development of historical skills while learning historical content. History curricula, across the Atlantic, embody historical knowledge in the school system. Historical knowledge, as explained by Peter Lee, is made up of two main components: substantive and procedural knowledge or concepts. Lee (1983) explains that the substantive knowledge contains the subject content knowledge of history such as significant historical phenomena, its protagonists and themes. Procedural knowledge or concepts, on the other hand, are the unique approaches and procedures historians use to provide the structure of the discipline.

Procedural concepts are essential to the substantive concepts as they serve as the historical skills that historians use to write the content of history (Lee & Ashby, 2000; Lévesque, 2008). Seixas and Morten (2013) define historical skills as the creative processes by which historians interpret sources from the past and generate historical knowledge. Seixas (2006) had noted that historical skills facilitate students' ability to engage in deeper levels in the study of the past. It is, therefore, important for history students to possess historical skills as they seek to understand the past and appreciate the work of historians. For history students to be regarded as possessing historical knowledge, they should be able to demonstrate mastery of both substantive and procedural knowledge. However, in most jurisdictions, there is a mismatch between what is stated in the history curricula and the assessment outcomes in the history classroom. There is thus a lack of emphasizes of assessment on measuring students' acquisition of procedural concepts or historical skills (Arthur & Bena, 2009). For instance, several studies have established that procedural concepts, through which students acquire historical skills, barely appear in students' written examinations in history education (Gómez & Miralles, 2015; Arthur & Bena, 2009). Van Sledright (2013) reports that tests commonly given in US schools produce a narrow and biased gauge of students' historical skills. Rosenlund (2011) also indicated a similar situation in Swedish schools. Gómez, Cózar and Miralles (2014) have explained that in Spain, the history curricula emphasizes substantive concepts, and not historical skills.

Oppong (2012) also reported that history assessments in Ghana high schools measured memorization and repetition. The focus on mental power over knowledge application deprives learners the higher level cognition attainable through history. For that reason, Trepot and Comes (2006) argued that assessment of students' learning in history is failing to provide opportunities for students to think about the ways historical knowledge is constructed: namely through analysis, reasoning, reflection and evaluation in history. The concerns reflect a continuing predominance of traditional modes of assessment in history education in schools (Oppong, 2010). But why teachers remain fixated on traditional assessment tools in history education remain largely uninterrogated. Reasonably, it is important to know whether students do not possess the right historical skills in history that compel teachers and other assessment bodies to limit students' assessment to lower-order cognitive skills in history. That is, it is not known, particularly in Ghana, whether history students possess historical skills that could be used to assess historical events. Its for this reason that the present work will seek to provide insight into history students' historical skills. Significant as well is the setting of the research in Ghana. This will provide a distinctively Ghanaian and Africa flair to assessment issues in history.

Domains of historical skills

The domains of historical skills reflect, but are not limited to, document literacy and evaluation skills. This means that the skills classified as historical skills are many and varied. For the purpose of this paper, the researcher focuses on document literacy and evaluation skills.

Document literacy skills

document-level literacy skills have been developed by Wineburg (1991).³ These include *sourcing*, *contextualization*, and *corroboration*. Central to the skill of the historian, these skills foster effective reconstruction of the past. Britt and Aglinskis (2002) note that history educators and curricula planners expect students to acquire these skills to better appreciate how the past is constructed through documents analysis.

Wineburg (1991) explains sourcing as the act of observing documents before reading the text of the documents. The observation of the documents should lead students to identify the author, author's position, date, title and type of document. Wineburg also explain corroboration as the act of comparing documents with one another; a way of communication between documents. This form of corroboration requires students to diligently detect disparities as well as reconcile disparities among documents. Students are usually expected to go back and forth between documents in order to develop understanding of the content of the document being analysed. Finally, Wineburg describes contextualization as the act of situating a document in its temporal and spatial context. Situating documents in context requires appropriate background information. Therefore, time and place of historical events become important in contextualisation. Contextual information provides an understanding of the behaviour or decisions of historical actors, the setting in which events took place, the reliability of a document, and the causes of historical events. The elements of sourcing, corroboration and contextualization are therefore to be used when students are analysing historical documents.

Several studies have established that history students do not analyse documents as historians appear to do. For instance, Wineburg (1991) indicated in his study of high school students in the US that history students did not analyse historical documents as historians do. First, he noted that students over-relied on their textbooks rather than primary or near primary source materials for historical analysis. Second, the students were not able to identify and acknowledge discrepancies among documents. Finally, the students could not situate documents in their appropriate spatial and temporal context. Rouet, Favart, Britt and Perfetti (1997) report similar findings of high school students in the US. They found students to be fledglings in document analysis.

These findings indicate that students do not digest historical documents as required of the discipline. Thus, students read historical materials without paying attention to the relevant details that rigorous analysis of historical materials involve. The palpable inability of student to engage in moderate to complex analysis commensurate with their level might be attributed to the instructional practices history teachers have been using in history classrooms. Also, the inadequacies of the assessment requirements of the respective national education systems may have been responsible. VanSledright (2002) had, for instance, mentioned that many state-mandated and locally mandated assessments done in schools seriously avoid test items that require the actual 'doing of history'. Notwithstanding the reasons, the findings are disturbing given the fact that the study of history requires the possession of the appropriate historical skills to enable students to engage in the unending dialogue between the past and present in the classroom. There's thus a need to understand the phenomenon in the Ghanaian context given the prominence of the place of history in high school education in Ghana.

Evaluative skills

Historical skills involve not only the document literacy skills, but also evaluation skills. Evaluation of historical evidence is central to the study of history and is a skill which is developed throughout the years of schooling. The reconstruction of the past requires evaluation of historical evidence. Historical evidence usually contains facts and arguments. Hence, the act of evaluating historical evidence would entail selection and interpretation of documents as well as the application of reasoning and reflection (Seixas, 2006). History students are expected to possess the skills involved in evaluation as they engage in the study of history. It is admitted that students cannot evaluate historical evidence as experts, however they are required to at least evaluate evidence in a manner that goes beyond naïve analysis (Perfetti, Britt, Rouet, Georgi & Mason, 1994). For instance, when students understand that historical events may reflect different lines of evidence that are established through different historical sources, they are likely to

subject historical evidence to **Critical Evaluation: Towards the End** Seikas and Peck (2004) argue that history teaching in schools should provide students with the skills to critically evaluate historical evidence as students seek to understand the past. Kvande and Naastad (2013) also make the point that if history students do not learn how historical evidence are interpreted, the students will have problems achieving the competence goals outlined in the history curriculum. It is, therefore, important to assess the evaluative skills of history students in Ghana. This would provide the opportunity to conclude whether history students in Ghana possess the appropriate skills in evaluating historical evidence.

Method

A case study was employed to address the task of this study. A case study is useful because it can give in-depth information and provide an opportunity for detailed analysis of the main characteristics of the phenomenon under study (Berg, 2004). One Senior High School in the Cape Coast Metropolis in Ghana was chosen for the study. The school was selected on the basis of the willingness of the school authorities to allow students to be examined by the researcher. Only students reading history as an elective subject were used for the study.

This research assessed historical skills among history students in a Senior High School in Ghana. The specific skills assessed are document literacy and evaluation skills. In assessing these skills, two instruments were employed. These were the use of test and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide. These instruments were given to a second person to ensure their reliability. Using document literacy skills, the researcher directly conducted a test to examine how students examine historical documents under sourcing, contextualisation and corroboration. Students were given different historical documents (presented to them as brief historical narration). These included letters, autobiographies, historian essays, novels, scholarly history materials, treaties, communiqué and textbook narrations (See Appendix). The documents had noticeable range of features on all the various variables. These variables included sourcing, contextualisation and corroboration. The students were given sourcing instructions which required them to attend to information about the authors of the documents, authors' position, motivation, participation, and linguistic style. Contextualisation instructions tasked the students to place the stories in the documents in appropriate contexts. Finally, corroboration instructions required students to compare the information in the various documents to identify which important statements are agreed on, which are uniquely mentioned, and which are discrepant. The students were to provide their responses in answer booklets given them. FGD was used to investigate how students evaluate historical evidence. The students were put into three groups of eight members each for this exercise. The FGD was conducted in three sessions in a day, and students were asked to share how they evaluate historical evidence.

All 22 students who participated in the study were in Form Three with an age range of 16-18. These students were used because they had studied history longer than those in Form One and Two. The total population of the Form Three students was 22. Because of the small number, all the 22 students were used.

The data analysis of the students' test consisted of three stages. The first stage involved marking the responses while making notes on them. These notes formed the summaries of the marked responses. The second stage included writing a single case for all the notes prepared from the students' responses. The third stage involved additional analyses and validity. The validity of the single case was checked against the accurate response sheet (marking sheet). This enabled the recognition of the similarities and differences between the single case and the appropriate response.

The FGD data analysis consisted of three primary actions: data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The first step reduced the data involved by coding. This process was followed with pattern coding (Merriam, 1998) whereby initial codes were grouped into constructs to further explain the data. After this, analytic memos were written to connect different parts of the data to develop conceptual ideas. This was done throughout the data collection to help guide and focus the researcher's thinking. Memos ranged from a few sentences to multiple pages. Interim case summaries were drafted to synthesize information

about each group, and this served as a starting point for cross-case analysis. During the final stage of analysis, alternative explanations were considered to further explain and verify each group's data. The cross-group analysis focused on similarities and differences across the three groups and helped explain the responses of the participants.

Limitation

In spite of the critical procedure followed, this study has a limitation. The use of one school as a case study is not comprehensively representative of how history students assess historical documents and evaluate historical evidence. Therefore, the results of this study are not widely applicable to other students due to the small sample. However, the findings may reflect the situation in some schools across the country and indeed around the world.

Results and Discussion

The results and discussion are presented under the two aspects. These aspects are document literacy skills and evaluation skills.

Document literacy skills

Generally, all the respondents did not demonstrate the literacy skills required to evaluate historical documents as proposed by Wineburg (1991). The results revealed that the students did not use the elements of sourcing such as author and author's position in their analysis of the documents. There was also no students' attempt to situate the events in the documents in an accurate spatial-temporal context. The students did not compare content across documents systematically and were only able to identify discrepancies in the documents.

To test students sourcing skill, they were given a set of related documents and were then asked to evaluate, from memory, the characteristics of the documents. All of them identified the document dates and document types. For instance, the students wrote that "*document 'A' is autobiography written in 1961*" "*documents 'B' 'D' and 'F' are scholarly history materials written in 1975, 1981 and 1982 respectively*" and "*document 'C' is a textbook narration*". However, the identification of dates on which documents were written is not a high order thinking skill in historical studies. Regarding the document type, the students were able to classify the documents under the following: textbook, autobiography, treaty, or scholarly book. Despite these, the more important characteristics of the documents such as authors' position, motivation, or participation, or linguistic style, and cultural setting were absent in students' write ups. These inadequacies provide a glimpse of the ability of student to undertake rudimentary information identification but not complex textual analysis. Knowing this weakness provides a possible starting point for classroom instruction.

On contextualization, a trial was made to know how learners associate texts to the social and epochal circumstances within which the works were produced. All the students who looked at the texts failed to provide a context for the historical events in the documents. One of the documents contained a narration of the 1948 riots in Ghana, and the responses provided by students on this document included: "*the narration in document 'G' is a war*", "*the event in document 'G' is a coup d'état*". However, the specific instruction of the test which required students to provide the date and place of the narration contained in the document were missing in students' write ups. Other documents on regional and global narrations which students were to situate in terms of date and place were also not accurately answered by students. More surprisingly, these students could not assess the documents from the modern perspective while considering the historical context. Students' were therefore not able to connect historical events and processes to specific circumstances of time and place as well as broader regional, national or global processes. The dearth of ability confirms Wineburg's (1998) contention that contextualisation is a more complex skill for students than sourcing.

Students' written responses also demonstrated limited corroborative skills. Corroboration involves directly comparing the information from the various sources to identify

similarities and differences in the various documents. The students were not able to differentially weigh the credibility of the information presented in the documents they were given. For instance, the students were not able to gauge the credibility of information in one document by the accumulation of similar information in another document (i.e., information in agreement with other texts). In the answer booklets, the students left many questions on corroboration unanswered. They were not able to identify a fact that another author had mentioned which could lead them to have more confidence in the accuracy of that information. Similar observations were made on information that is incomplete. While students could identify discrepancies in documents, they were unable to point out incomplete information. The students identified the discrepancies by noting that some authors were being deceptive or purposefully misleading. One student noted that: *“the account of the author in document ‘B’ was not to be trusted because there were a lot of contradictions in his narration of the event”* and *“the author in document ‘F’ provided misleading account of the coming of the Europeans to Africa.”*

The findings indicate that students do not diligently apply sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration when reading historical materials. They apply the elements of sourcing less than they were able to read rudimentary information such as dates and document types on historical materials. Dexterity in knowing authors’ position, motivation, or participation, or linguistic style were less noticeable by students. Furthermore, student did not contextualise historical events and could not corroborate information prior to incorporating new information into their representation of the story. Rather, they were only able to note discrepancies among documents. The implication here is that the teaching of history in this school focuses on the content of the syllabus rather than the acquisition of historical skills. Confirmed here is Oppong’s (2012) finding that Ghanaian school history focuses on tests and standards rather than the acquisition of skills that will help students appreciate historical raw data. Teachers may have been concentrating on how students will pass examination and not the acquisition of skills that are often not examined in students’ final examination.

Similar results have been found in other studies (e.g., Britt, Perfetti, Van Dyke, & Gabrys, 2000; Monte-Sano, 2011; Wineburg, Martin & Monte-Sano, 2011; Reisman & Wineburg, 2012). For instance, a study by Wineburg, Martin & Monte-Sano (2011) criticised the way in which American high school students read written documents, such as diaries and letters. The authors indicated that the students did not have the ability to consider the intentions of the writer of the document and to place the text in the context in which it was written. Wineburg (1991) had earlier made the point that high school history students did not see the hidden information in the text because they were so focused on the direct information provided by the text. Students viewed the documents as sources of information without paying sufficient attention to the status of the authors. The students lacked the skills of the historian. Students could not compare different documents to one another, and reflect on the motives behind them (Wineburg et al., 2011). The findings of this study are consistent with those of earlier studies that indicated that high school students do not approach documents in the same manner as historians appear to do (Rouet, Favart, Britt, & Perfetti, 1997; Wineburg, 1991). For example, the students used for this study made limited observation of the historical documents that they were examined on. It should be noted that historical documents are important sources of history when documents are properly analysed to reflect the intents of the writers. Perhaps, students are not aware of the privileged status of documents in the study of history (Perfetti, Britt, Rouet, Georgi & Mason, 1994).

The knowledge of these students is possibly informed by the idea that historical information is constant and unchanging. That belief of history as ‘cast in stone’ informs the uncritical receptivity of student to historical information. But such an approach belittles the intellectual capacity of the learners. Students should be able to challenge or critique the interpretation of authors or even the ways in which the writer presents historical facts. It is therefore important for students, in an ideal history class, to master both content and procedural knowledge in the study of history. However, it has been established that history teaching that seeks to enable students acquire the appropriate historical skills does not have a long tradition (Rantala, 2012) in history education. There is a need to change the narrative through a reorientation of teachers to focus on building students’ document literacy skills.

The data collected through FGD addressed the second domain of the historical skills. The FGD established that students only tuned to history textbooks and teachers to understand historical information. They did not strive to apply class expertise in evaluating historical evidence. All the students suggested that they did not select and interpret evidence when examining historical events. What they did was to present the facts as they are. The following comments are worth noting: *“the textbook contains evaluated evidence and so, that is what [we] use anytime history is taught”*; *“any historical information presented either from museums or documents, [we] turn to the history textbook and the history teacher for explanation and do not evaluate anything by myself”*; and *“In fact, [we] don’t select and interpret any historical evidence because everything has been done in the textbook”*. The students explained that they needed to present the information in the history textbook in order to pass examinations. The comment of one discussant summarises the view of the respondents: *“Sir, I must be honest, because of examination and the need for me to pass, I don’t evaluate any historical evidence even those in the textbook. I present the information in the textbook as it is without any analysis”*. This suggests that history students tend not to evaluate uncertainties in the available evidence on any historical event. Students usually do not segment historical evidence into the three aspects (basic historical facts, contextualisation, and inter-subjectivity) required for evaluation. It can be argued that students’ inability to segment historical evidence into appropriate historical context may be as a result of not being taught these skills.

The three aspects, noted above, are the most important aspects of historical evidence that students require to focus on in the study of history. The findings imply that students study history in a manner that does not reflect the investigative nature of the history subject. Thus, the students did not evaluate evidence to draw appropriate conclusions. However, historical thinking requires the ability to understand historical evidence in its context, recognize its limitations, and assess the points of view that it reflects. This enables students to craft appropriate historical arguments from historical evidence. As the findings suggest, students are not likely to define and frame questions about the past and to address those questions by constructing appropriate arguments. Plausible and convincing arguments need clear, comprehensive and logical scrutiny, supported by relevant historical evidence. This could be achieved if students have the capacity to describe, analyze, and evaluate the arguments of others in the light of historical evidence. The findings, therefore, contradict the suggestion that history students evaluate uncertainties in historical evidence on any historical event, though such evaluation is not done in an expert fashion (Perfetti, Britt, Rouet, Georgi & Mason, 1994).

Further evidence that students are not skilled in evaluating historical evidence came from their answers. First, students noted that they did not know the relevance of evaluating historical narratives and evidence because *“the evidence has already been evaluated so no need for evaluation”* and *“We don’t see the need to evaluate what have been presented in the books because they have been evaluated”* (two respondents shared these views). Such findings may provide a possible reason for students’ tendency to ignore the need to evaluate historical evidence. If students think the important material has already been summarized in the history textbook, they have little incentive to spend time trying to evaluate historical evidence. Second, it was noted that the students did not possess the skills to critically approach historical narratives or evaluate historical evidence. For instance, they noted that: *“[We] have not been taught how to evaluate historical evidence, so it will be difficult to do any evaluation of evidence”* and *“We don’t have the knowledge and skills to evaluate historical evidence. In fact, we have not attempted that before. We read and present the information as it is”*. It means that the students were not adequately competent in evaluation skills or they have not been taught how to evaluate historical evidence at the high school level. Wineburg (1991) cautions that the lack of evaluation skills is not helpful for students, as they remain ignorant of the basic skills used to create historical interpretations. This lack of skills always compels students to rely on textbooks for answers to historical questions. It is not suggested that students ought to have full attainment of historical evaluation skills like the practicing historian, but there is the need for students to have basic skills with which they could employ to acquaint themselves in the evaluation of evidence.

In Ghana, less attention and space are given to ensure students acquire the skill of evaluation because from the perspective of these students, the whole issue has been reduced to a marginal

position in the textbook (Fellman & Raatikainen, 2012). Evaluation of historical evidence has been overshadowed by the use of history textbooks in history education. This reinforces VanSledright's (2002) belief that historical knowledge is the ability of students to reproduce the sort of "facts" found in school history textbooks. As Hicks, Doolittle and Lee (2004) claim, many teachers of history know the value of engaging history students to appropriately read and interpret primary and secondary source documents, however teachers continue to use only history textbooks on a daily basis in history classrooms across the Atlantic. History teaching in schools is perhaps limited to content knowledge than procedural knowledge, as observed earlier. This may suggest the marginalisation of procedural knowledge in history lessons. It is worth noting that history is an art of interpretation and representation, and, therefore, failure to acquire the skill of interpretation may not help students to make appropriate analysis in history. As such, Seixas and Peck (2004) advocate that in schools, history should be taught to students with the aim of assisting them to acquire the skills to critically evaluate historical narratives. Such skills will enable students to critically interpret evidence in order to achieve the goals outlined in the history curriculum (Kvande & Naastad, 2013).

Conclusion

The study has established two significant findings. First, the study has shown that students do not apply sourcing, contextualisation and corroboration appropriately when reading historical documents as required. They rather engage in noting discrepancies and dates of documents as well as document type. This is largely reflective of how students have been taught history in school. This observation suggests that students are likely to read history texts as story books. If historical materials are used in the same manner as story books, then the act of 'doing history' would not be achieved through history teaching. Second, it has been revealed that the students did not evaluate historical evidence but referred to the textbook and the history teacher for answers in the study of history. Students tend to rely on the history textbook without evaluating what the textbook presents as historical evidence. The finding further suggests how history classes often promote teaching that is still quite uninspiring, using history books uncritically and without challenging students to know the limitations of history textbooks. This practice may not allow students to appreciate how history is written by historians.

Recommendations

The findings have shed some light on the kind of thinking that teachers need to encourage or support their students' progress towards dealing with the complexities of historical skills. The acquisition of the skills would enable students appreciate the nature of the discipline and also expose them to how historians construct the past. History teachers therefore need to emphasize the importance of historical skills and also engage students in the use of such skills. More specifically, history teachers should introduce document-based methods in the history classroom. Teachers should make use of primary and secondary sources when teaching history. The use of these materials would engage students in the evaluation process of sourcing, contextualising and corroborating as they seek to make sense of the materials in the classroom.

The scholarship of teaching and learning history has had a *pedagogical turn* in recent years necessitating the engagement of students to think critically about the past. Teachers are key players in any effort to change the way history is practiced in schools. To help students evaluate historical evidence, teachers must treat students' work as evidence to be evaluated using discipline-specific strategies. By this, the teachers would stress the processes involved in guiding students to become experts in their thinking, rather than concentrating solely on the need to pass examination or class exercises. There should be a focus on what the scholar of historical cognition, Sam Wineburg (1994, p. 116), has called "the moments of confusion before an interpretation emerge..." Thus, history teaching should be done to enable students to analyse multiple narratives through the interpretation of materials. This approach should go beyond the teacher-centered narrative. The significance is that history classrooms will be converted places

where, as Salvatori (2002) envisions, evidence of student learning becomes ‘a litmus test’ for the theories that inform a teacher’s approach. Teaching with this approach enables students to better understand the past and expand their historical understanding.

References

- Arthur, C., & Bena, K. (2009). *Habits of mind across the curriculum: Practical and creative strategies for teachers*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Berg, L. B. (2004). *Qualitative Research Methods for social sciences*. New York: Omeyatyp Typograph Inc.
- Betram, C. (2012). Exploring a historical gaze: A language of description for the practice of school history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 44(3), 429-442.
- Britt, A., & Aglinskias, C. (2002). Improving students’ ability to identify and use source information. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20 (4), 485–522.
- Britt, M. A., Perfetti, C. A., & Van Dyke, J. A., & Gabrys, G. (2000). The sourcer’s apprentice. A tool for document- supported history instruction. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history* (Pp. 437-470). New York: The New York University Press.
- Drapper, R. J., Broomhead, P., Nokes, J. D., & Siebert, D. (2010). *Supporting disciplinary literacies: (Re) imagining content and literacy instruction*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Reading Conference/ Literacy Research Association. December 2, 2010.
- Fellman, S., & Rahikainen, M. (2012). *Historical knowledge: In quest of theory, method and evidence*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Gomez, C. J., & Miralles, P. (2015). Pensar historiicamente o memorizar el pasado? La eevaluacion de los contenidos historicos en la educacion obligatoria en Espana. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 52, 52-68.
- Gomez, C. J., Cozar, R., & Miralles, P. (2014). La ensenanza de la historia y el analisis de libros de texto. Construccin de identidades y iesarrollo de competencias. *Ensayos*, 29 (1), 1-25.
- Hick, D. D., Doolittle, P., & Lee, J. (2004). Social studies teachers’ use of classroom-based and web-based historical primary sources. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 32, 213-247.
- Kvande, L., & Naastad, N. (2013). *Hvaskalvi med historie? Historiedidaktikk i teoriogpraksis*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Lee, P. (1983). History teaching and philosophy of history. *History and Theory*, 22, 19- 49.
- Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students age 7-14. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.) *knowing, teaching, and learning history. National and international perspectives* (pp. 199-222). New York: New York University Press.
- Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically, educating students for the Twenty-First century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Miles, M., & Huberman A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded resource book*. London: SAGE Publishers.
- Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 52, 96-107.
- Monte- Sano, C. (2011). Beyond reading comprehension and summary: Learning to read and write in history by focusing on evidence, perspective, and interpretation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(2), 212-249
- Oppong, C. A. (2010). *An evaluation of the teaching and learning of history in senior high schools in the Central Region of Ghana*. An unpublished Master’s Thesis submitted to the University of Cape Coast.
- Oppong, C. A. (2012). *Teaching and learning of history: An evaluation in the senior high schools in the Central Regions of Ghana*. Saarbruken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Perfetti, C. A., Britt, M. A., Rouet, J-F., Georgi, M. C., & Mason, R. A. (1994). How students use texts to learn and reason about historical uncertainty. In Carretero M., Voss J. M (Eds.), *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and social sciences* (pp.257-283). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Reisman, A., & Wineburg, S. (2012). Ways of knowing and the history classroom: Supporting disciplinary

discussion and reasoning about texts. In M. Carrero, M. Asensio, & M. Rodriguez- Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp.171-188). Charlotte, NC: Information and Age Publishing.

- Rantala, J. (2012). How Finnish adolescent understand history: Disciplinary thinking in history and its assessment among 16-year-old Finns. *Education Sciences*, 2(4), 193-207. Retrieved June 10, 2014, from <http://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/2/4/193>.
- Robinson, A. C. (1959). *Athens in the age of pericles*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Rosenlund, D. (2011). *AttHanteraHistoriaMedet Toga Stangt: Samtammighet Mellan Historia A Och Larares Prov Och Uppgifter*. Lunds Universitet Och Malmo Hogskola: Forskarskolani Historia Och Historiedidakti.
- Rouet, J. F., Favart, M., Britt, M. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1997). Studying and using multiple documents in history: Effects of discipline expertise. *Cognition and Instruction*, 15, 85-106.
- Salvatori, M. R. (2002). The scholarship of teaching: Beyond the anecdotal. *Pedagogy* 2(3), 297-310
- Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The big six. Historical thinking concepts*. Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd.
- Seixas, P. (2006). *Benchmark of historical thinking: A framework for assessment in Canada*. Canada: Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness. Retrieved from http://historicalthinking.ca/sites/default/files/Framework_Benchmark.Pdf
- Seixas, P., & Peck, C. (2004). Teaching historical thinking. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 109-117). Vancouver, Canada: Pacific Educational Press.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content area literacy. *Harvard Education Review*, 78, 40-59.
- Trepát, C., & Comes, P. (2006). *El tiempo y el espacio en la didáctica de las ciencias sociales*. Barcelona: ICE/Grao.
- VanSledright, B. (2002). Confronting history's interpretive paradox while teaching fifth graders to investigate the past. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 1089-1115.
- VanSledright, B. (2013). *Assessing historical thinking and understanding. Innovative designs for new standards*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Wineburg, S., & Monte-Sano, C. (2011). *Reading like a historian: Teaching literacy in middle and high school history classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science*, 22, 319- 346.
- Wineburg, S. (1994). The cognitive representation of historical texts. In G. Leinhardt, I. L. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in history* (pp. 85-136). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wineburg, S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 73-87.
- Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 495- 519.

APPENDICES

SAMPLE TEST

INSTRUCTION FOR THE TEST

SOURCING

You are required to attend to information about the authors of the documents, authors' position, motivation, participation, and linguistic style in the documents provided.

CONTEXTUALISATION

Place the stories in the documents in the appropriate contexts of time and place.

CORROBORATION

You are required to compare the information in the various documents to identify which important statements are agreed on, which are uniquely mentioned, and which are discrepant.

My name is Baffour Osei Akoto, I was born on Monday, 22nd February, 1904 at Dontoaso (Adum) Kumasi, a place no longer in existence but is believed to have been in the vicinity of the road in front of the Unicorn House in the present day Kumasi.

My father was Opanin Owusu Sekyere, the paternal grandson of Nana Osei Bonsu Panin, Asantehene who reigned between 1800 and 1824. He was a trader; dealing mainly in slaves, kolanuts and rubber. When this enterprise was no longer lucrative, he became an arms-dealer, supplying guns, gunpowder and lead which proved to be profitable. During my father's youth, he fought in many wars for the Asante Nation; among them was the Civil War in 1888 which broke out during the installation of Nana Prempeh I (Asantehene). This war was precipitated by the challenge posed by his cousin, Atwereboana whose support came from the people of Kwabere and Sekyere. Nana Prempeh I was also supported by Atwima and Amansie. He fought again in the Nkoranza war in 1893 and in the Yaa Asantewaa War of 1900 against the British.

My father was resident both in Kumasi and Ankaase. He became the Akwamuhene of Ankaase and later chief of Ankaase, Kyidomhene of Kumasi in the year 1920 after the destoolment of Baffour Kofi Nsenkyire of Butaasi, Asante Mampong.

My mother was Obaapanin Akosua Appiaah, Queen Mother of my village, Hemang-Asante. She was the daughter of Ohenenana-Amma Serwaa Eno, who was the granddaughter of the Asantehene, Nana Osei Yaw Akoto. I had a sister called Akosua Nimo, alias Akosua Asantewaa and a brother Osei Kwame. My mother who was unassuming, quiet, but firm, was one of the early market women, trading in dried fish and meat etc. Later, she became a vegetable farmer. When my grandmother died in 1932, at the age of 100, she took over her mother's business dealing in wine, spirits and moneylending. My mother later on succeeded her mother as the queen mother of Hemang and died on 3rd August, 1939 at the age of 82. Akosua Nimo, my sister, succeeded her after her death as queen mother of Hemang. In Kumasi, my father was staying at Dominasi, where the regional G.N.T.C. Head-quarters is situated today, near Kejetia.

During my youthful days, Kumasi was a very small town stretching from Kejetia where Mr. John Haick's two-storey house is presently situated, to Old Dadieso near the house from where Mr. J.K. Manu dispatches his yams to overseas today.

In 1826, the British government refused to recognise Asante control over certain coastal states which led to war. The British government led the Akyem, Akuapem and the Ga to defeat the Asante invasion at the Battle of Akatamanso (near Dodowa). Asante was forced under Maclean's Treaty of 1831 to give up any claim over Southern part of the country.

In 1863, Asante was provoked again into invading the south to defend her claim of jurisdiction over a subject Kwesi Gyani. Kwesi Gyani had kept a gold nugget he found contrary to Asante custom. He ran to the South to escape judgment and when the British government refused to give him up, Asante invaded the South.

Asante and the British clashed again in 1869 over an agreement between the British and the Dutch. On March 1867, the British and the Dutch without consulting the people concerned signed the Sweet River Convention by which they agreed to exchange forts.

1. We have already made known to the world the circumstances which have compelled the Ghana Armed Forces to take over once again the reins of the government of this country. The reasons we have given, therefore, need not be repeated.

2. However, as accredited representatives of countries which have enjoyed and, I hope, which still desire to maintain cordial relations with Ghana, we have deemed it necessary to meet you today in order to inform you of the broad principles on which Ghana's foreign relations will be conducted by the National Redemption Council.

Immediately on the publication of the Lands Bill, the Gold Coast Aborigines Rights Protection Society came into being, as an exemplary direct action to oppose the attempt to declare all lands in the Gold Coast to be Crown lands.

Almost all of the great figures who formed that Society and fought the country's battle to a successful issue are dead, and among them the great Sarbah at a regrettably premature age, and the veteran J. P. Brown (1843—1932), President of the Society at the time of his death, and for well over half his lifetime called and known affectionately throughout the Gold Coast as "Father" Brown, as evidence of his venerable personality. Between him and John Mensah Sarbah it is difficult to choose the man who deserves greater notice for the part played by him in the formation of the Society, and the protest and opposition to the Lands Bill. Mention may be made also of Edmund Bannerman (1832—1903), journalist and a man of wit, who made a large and noticeable contribution to the life of the century in raising politics to a high intellectual level.

The Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) was quite different from the previous military administrations of the country. The new government was a two-tier administration. It was headed by Flt. Lt. J. J. Rawlings (Chairman), and the council which constituted supreme body, comprised members of the military and some civilians appointed by the Chairman.

Thus, for the first time in the military rule of the country, while the police were excluded from the ruling body, some selected civilians including a retired judge of the superior court were appointed to serve on the PNDC.

The second-tier of the administration comprised mostly civilian secretaries of state with P. V. Obeng as Chairman of the Committee of Secretaries. Another civilian member, Alhaji Mahama Iddrisu was assigned responsibility for the Ministry of Defence.

Following the removal of Acheampong from office, General F.W.K. Akuffo, then Commander of the Armed Forces and a leading member of Acheampong's Supreme Military Council I, was sworn in as Head of the reconstituted military government. In the reconstitution of the SMC, more than half of the members who had served under Acheampong were retired. They included Major-General Kotei, Major-General Utuka and Mr. Ernest Arko.

New members were appointed to serve on the new council. Among them were Lt. Gen Hamidu (the new Chief of Defence Staff), Major-General Odartey-Wellington (Army commander), Major-General Osei Boateng (Border Guards Commander) and Mr. Kwakye (Inspector-General of Police). Many other officers in the police force serving as commissioners in the ministries and regions were withdrawn to the barracks and civilians were appointed to replace them.

The new policy or concept of "conditional independence" which the colonial powers are now planning to adopt, is a policy which is intended to create several weak independent states in Africa. These States are designed to be so weak and unstable in the organisation of their national economies and administrations that they will be compelled by internal as well as external pressures to continue to depend upon the colonial powers who have ruled them for several years. The weaker and the less stable an African State is, the easier it is for the colonial power concerned to continue to dominate the affairs and fortunes of the new State, even though it is supposed to have gained independence.

Disturbances broke out in Accra where European stores were looted out. The event was to boycott European and other expatriate goods. The event was organized and led by Nii Kwabena Bonnie III who was the then Osu Alata Mantse. The riot later spread like fire to other towns like Koforidua, Kumasi, Nsawam, Nkawkaw, Sekondi-Takoradi.

The disturbances which originated from Accra and spread to some regional capitals were sparked off by the shooting incident at the Christianborg Castle crossroads. The shooting incident injured people and claimed the lives of three Ghanaian ex-servicemen namely, Sergeant Adjetey, Corporal Attipoe and Private Odartey Lamptey who led a demonstration to submit the grievances of ex-servicemen to the colonial Governor. However, behind the riots were various underlying economic, social and political considerations.

1. All human sacrifices and other primitive customs such as ~~human sacrifices~~ were contrary to law and such the chiefs should desist from such practices.
2. Crimes such as murder, robbery and others should be tried before the British judicial officers and the chiefs of the districts, moulding the customs of the country to the general principles of British law.
3. It was stated that the chiefs who signed the Bond had agreed in principle to recognise the power and jurisdiction which had been going on in their states, that is, they all agreed to protect individuals and property.

1. By the terms of the Treaty, Asante was to pay a war indemnity of 600 ounces of gold to the British spread over a period of time with two royals, Owusu Ansa and Owusu Nkwantabisa as sureties.
2. All claims of sovereignty over the Kings of Denkyira, Assin, Akyem, Adanse and other allies of Her Majesty, formerly subject to the Kingdom of Asante was renounced.
3. All Asante troops stationed in the South-West were to be withdrawn and the trade routes kept free and safe for all traders.
4. In return, the Southern States agreed to keep open, all paths passing through their territories for all persons to engage in the legitimate trade.
5. Finally, the Asantehene was to ensure the total end to the practice of certain unwholesome practices like human sacrifices and panyarring.