

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

AN EVALUATION OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF HISTORY  
IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE CENTRAL REGION OF GHANA

BY

CHARLES ADABO OPPONG

Thesis submitted to the Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education of  
the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the award of Master of Philosophy Degree in Curriculum  
Studies

AUGUST 2009

**DECLARATION**

**Candidate's Declaration**

*I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this University or elsewhere.*

Candidate's

Signature.....Date.....

Name: Charles Adabo Oppong

**Supervisors' Declaration**

*We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.*

Principal Supervisor's Signature.....

Date.....

Name: Dr. Cosmas Cobbold

Co-supervisor's Signature.....

Date.....

Name: Dr. Fiifi Mensah

## ABSTRACT

The study evaluated the teaching and learning of history in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana. Specifically, the study focused on the methods of teaching the subject, learning styles of students, teaching-learning resources, assessment instruments and teachers' and students' perceptions of the subject.

Data were collected from documents, through the use of questionnaire and observation of classroom lessons. The internal reliability co-efficient of the questionnaire was .735. The sample comprised 570 students (selected randomly) and all the 31 history teachers from all the Senior High Schools in the Central Region which offer History. Frequencies, percentages and means were the main statistical tools employed for the data analysis.

The study found that the most prominent methods of teaching history, in order of ranking, were the question and answer, discussion and lecture methods. Students were found to use both audio-visual and active-reflective learning styles. The findings also revealed the inadequacy of instructional resources in the schools and teachers' use of class tests and exercises in assessing students' learning outcomes. Finally, the study found that history teachers have a positive perception of the teaching of the subject while history students have a negative perception of the learning of the subject. It is recommended that teachers should adopt interactive teaching methods and use investigative study and project work in assessing students' learning outcomes. Also, the Ghana Education Service should provide instructional resources to schools.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible without the support of many people. In the first place, my deepest gratitude goes to my principal supervisor, Dr. Cosmas Cobbold, for his fatherly love, advice and contribution. Indeed, he provided the intellectual gusto that helped shape the work to its present standard. I also express great thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Fiifi Mensah, for his patience and guidance which have made this work possible.

I wish to thank Prof E. K. Tamakloe for his moral and material support during this research work. I must also express my earnest gratitude to lecturers of the Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education (DASSE) for their advice and encouragement.

Finally, I am indebted to my colleagues Bernard Yaw Sekyi Acquah, Tufuor Kwarteng, Winston Abroampa, Eric Mensah, Isaac N. Mwinlaaru and Leticia Bosu. To you all, I say thank you.

Any weaknesses in the work are, however, solely mine.

**DEDICATION**

To my parents, siblings and uncle, Frank Ohenebeng.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purposes of the Study	8
Research Questions	8
Significance of the Study	9
Delimitation of the Study	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Organisation of the Study	11
2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Theoretical Framewor	12
Other Types of Evaluation	18
The Senior High School History Syllabus	26
Learning Styles	44
Perception	48
Related Studies on Curriculum Evaluation	49
3 METHODOLOGY	63

Research Design	63
Population	64
Sample and Sampling Technique	65
Research Instruments	66
Validity and Reliability of Instrument	67
Data Collection Procedure	68
Data Analysis	69
4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	71
Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	72
Teaching Techniques Used by Teachers	76
Availability and Use of Instructional Resources	84
Assessment Instruments	92
Learning Styles Used by History Students	95
Perceptions of Teachers	99
Perceptions of Students	103
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	110
Summary of the Research Process	110
Main Findings	111
Conclusions	112
Recommendations	113
Areas for Further Research	114
REFERENCES	116
APPENDICES	
A. Letter of Introduction	131
B. List of Schools Offering History	132

C. Teachers' Questionnaire	134
D. Students' Questionnaire	142
E. Observation Guide	150



**LIST OF TABLES**

Table	Page
1 Gender of Teachers	72
2 Age Distributions of Teachers	73
3 Highest Academic Qualification of Teachers	73
4 Highest Professional Qualification of Teachers	74
5 Number of Years of Teaching History	75
6 Gender of Students	75
7 Age Distribution of Students	76
8 Teachers' and Students' Opinion on the Frequency of Use of Teaching Methods	78
9 Teachers' View on the Availability and Adequacy of Resources	85
10 Students' Views on the Availability and Adequacy of Resources	86
11 Teachers' Views on the Frequency of Use of Instructional Resources	89
12 Students' Views on the Frequency of Use of Instructional Resource	90
13 Respondents' Views on How Often Assessment Instruments are Used in the Teaching of History	93
14 Audio and Visual Learning Styles	96
15 Active and Reflective Learning Styles	97
16 Teachers' Perceptions of the Teaching of History	100
17 Students' Perceptions of the Learning of History	104

18 Respondents' View on Periods Devoted to Teaching of History per  
week in Schools 108

19 Respondents' Rating of Periods Allocated for Teaching History 109

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### **Background to the Study**

History has been recognized all over the world as a source of enlightenment and development. As a collective memory of the past of a nation, history attempts to bring to the fore the salient and significant events that occurred in the past, which could be utilized in building a prosperous national future. This is why every human society, no matter the level of advancement, has placed optimum priority on the bequeathing of a "useable past" from generation to generation. For instance, in ancient cultures, every kingdom had its own history laureate whose task was to remember the past. Modernity has also been influenced greatly by the enhanced production of history, thus assisting nations in their tasks of nation building, promoting national consciousness, the blossoming of moral leadership and ensuring overall national development. It may, therefore, be argued that history is an essential instrument for any nation that is desirous of breakthroughs in all human endeavours.

The teaching of history as a discipline has a long history in the world. According to the Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1965), “the systematic teaching of history in secondary schools has its origin in the work of Thomas Arnold, Headmaster of Rugby from 1828 to 1842” (p.1). The Association further states that the study of history as a subject increased tremendously in the schools and places of higher education during the last thirty years of the nineteenth century.

With respect to Ghana, history teaching dates back to the colonial days. During those days it was taught as a subject in both the missionary schools and the schools established by the colonial masters. After independence, it continued to enjoy its place in the school curriculum. History was one of the four subjects, which were written during the Middle School Leaving Certificate Examination (M.S.L.C.E). History was also offered in the Secondary Schools from form one up to form five as an elective subject for Arts students who wrote the School Certificate and General Certificate of Education Ordinary Level (SC/GCE ‘O’ Level). At the sixth form, history was one of the subjects offered for the General Certificate of Education Advanced Level (GCE ‘A’ level) examination. After the introduction of the 1987 educational reform, history was incorporated into social studies at the basic school level and offered as an elective for General Arts students at the senior secondary school (now senior high school) level.

This long history of the teaching of history in the world and more especially Ghana is the result of the importance of the subject as an academic discipline. First, history provides patriotic motives to students (Crookall, 1975). Indeed, when history was taught first as a school subject, patriotism

was almost its only objective (Dance, 1970). People educate their young ones about past activities of some people to equip the rising generation with the skill it needs if the life of the society is to be carried on (Crookall, 1975).

The activities involved in the study of history also develop the reasoning ability of the learner. History provides skills such as thinking critically about documents, cause and effect relationships, and ability to read and summarize material. Critical thinking skills are what learners need in order to work through, articulate and argue in support of their own positions on matters that concern them. Such activities, perhaps, cause the individual to be engaged in both inductive and deductive reasoning which, in turn, develop the reasoning ability of the person. According to Gosden and Sylvester (1968), such activities help boys and girls to understand themselves better and then develop the ability to understand and respond to other people. Thus, these skills enable students to function creatively and positively in their jobs, as well as in their labour unions, companies, professional organizations, among others. These educational and life skills are not only important for the individual but are also essential skills if learners are to participate actively and capably as citizens in this democratic era. For without the social awareness and analytical skills which learners can develop through the study of history, they will forever remain susceptible to propaganda and political manipulation. Equipping today's learners to become active and critical citizens is essential to the task of nation-building (Bam & Visser, 2002).

Another reason why history teaching has enjoyed a considerable value in the school curriculum is its purpose of implanting moral values in the minds of the young ones. Historical topics have implicit moral issues and to exclude

them from the classroom is unacceptable (Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, 1965). Gosden and Sylvester (1968) posit that “when the subject first began to appear on the curricula of schools in the nineteenth century, it was widely regarded as a vehicle for the transmission of moral ideas” (p.2). Indeed, it could be argued that apart from the study of literature and religion, history lends itself more than any other subject to the inculcation of moral values in the students’ minds. As Johnson (1940) posits, “history was regarded as of great value in cultivating judgment and in stimulating right conduct” (p.30).

In history lessons, the past can be seen as a kind of a stage on which the students see all kinds of men and women (Crookall, 1975). Therefore, their deeds, misdeeds, their courage, wisdom, folly, their achievements, both good and bad, tend to influence the students’ sense of moral values (Crookall, 1975). This means that history describes the vices, unmask the false virtues and exposes the errors done by men (Johnson, 1940). The students’ minds and character are therefore influenced through history teaching. Gosden and Sylvester (1968) indicate that much of the purpose of history teaching in the nineteenth century was to inspire a sense of moral indignation against the crimes of political leaders such as Napoleon or Charles I.

In addition, as an academic discipline, history also quickens the imaginative abilities of the students. Crookall (1975) indicates that history offers the material, which is able to stir the imagination of people more than any other subject. He defines imagination as that power in the human being which enables him or her to be aware of things and people not present in his or her sense and to take part in experiences which are not his or hers (Crookall,

1975). The fact is, history is the study of past events and both the external and internal aspects of past human actions are generally not observable. Johnson (1940) opines, “Human observation, memory and inferences are fallible. Even our own experiences of yesterday may emerge faded and distorted from the accounts which we strive to give of them today” (p.7). Chaffer and Taylor (1975) also admit that in all history activities, it is the process of sifting out evidence from the dust heap of the past in order to understand man’s achievement. This therefore calls for imagination, mature judgment, careful balancing of facts and meticulous attention to detail to be able to understand and appreciate them (Pamela, 1974). To understand history properly, “a quality of sympathetic imagination is needed” (Jamieson, 1971, p.5). Gosden and Sylvester (1968) also comment on the use of imagination in the study of history:

A considerable part of the understanding of history depends on the imaginative reconstruction of another person’s points of view and in their study of history, children should be constantly asked to make this act of the imagination, to capture another person’s feelings, to recognize his thoughts and to interpret his motives (p.4).

Finally, history develops in those who study it a spirit of tolerance. History is the subject that promotes sympathies and genuine tolerance (Crookall, 1975). The creation of a tolerant outlook and the enlargement of human sympathies are important for peaceful human living. On the other hand, “Lack of sympathy leading to intolerance between one group and another, between one nation and another, has always been one of the major

causes of war and conflict” (Crookall, 1975, p.20). The foregoing discussion indicates that history performs important functions in the school curriculum.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Recognizing the long history of the teaching of the subject in Ghana and its academic and social importance, one would assume that history lessons will be very interesting and history classes will always be filled with students. However, it seems the opposite is the case. A look at the classrooms in the Senior High Schools in Ghana shows that history lessons tend to be the duller and history classes are habitually empty when compared with attendance to lessons in Government. For instance, data gathered by the researcher from Adisadel College and Saint Augustine’s College, both Senior High Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis, indicate that in the former school, 321 and 512 students read history and government between 2004 and 2007 respectively. In the latter school, 420 and 670 students read history and government respectively in the same period. Dwarko (2007) also concludes in his study that in Senior High Schools in Ghana history is the least patronized among the Arts subjects in recent times. It is quite obvious that history is losing its place in the Ghanaian educational system as compared to the other Arts subjects.

It also appears that most students who are admitted to read history from first year drop the subject to pursue other Arts subjects before their final examination. Odamtten (1993) confirms this and explains that wrong approaches are used to teach history, which makes the subject not interesting with the result that students’ interest in the subject whittles down and it is dropped at the slightest opportunity.



This state of affairs may also be attributed to teachers' use of inappropriate teaching techniques. Crookall (1975) lends credence to this by intimating that "if a history lesson is dull, it is probably because of our bad way of teaching it" (p.56). It could also be that, the non-use of multiple teaching and learning resources (TLRs) during history lessons make the subject sterile, resulting in boredom.

Again, the psychological state of a teacher can either have positive or negative effect on the teaching and learning process. Huberman (1983) observes that the psychological state of a teacher can have either positive or negative effect on an implementation process. For instance, a teacher with a negative disposition towards a programme will not be enthusiastic towards its implementation. This implies that a teacher's state of mind is indispensable in the implementation process. Kundu and Tutoo (1988) concur that teachers' and learners' performance will not represent the best if their perception of and attitude to what they do are not favourable. In other words, history teachers' and students' perceptions of and attitude to the subject are likely to affect their commitment towards the subject, which will subsequently translate into teachers' input and learners' outcomes.

Assessment of learners is crucial to every educational endeavour, especially in the teaching and learning of history, since there has always been the notion that history is about 'chewing and pouring' of dates. There is the tendency, therefore, to rely on paper and pencil test, which is only based on the cognitive domain to the neglect of other procedures and domains. The issues raised above point to a need to evaluate the teaching and learning of history in Ghana's Senior High Schools.

### **Purposes of the Study**

The main focus of the study was to evaluate the teaching and learning of history in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana. Specifically, it was geared towards finding out:

1. techniques history teachers use in the teaching of the subject.
2. teaching and learning resources available for history lessons..
3. instruments employed by history teachers to assess students' learning
4. learning styles history students use in the study of the subject outcomes in the subject.
5. teachers' perceptions of the teaching of history.
6. students' perceptions of the learning of history.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What teaching techniques do history teachers use during history lessons?
2. What teaching and learning resources are available for history lessons?
3. What instruments do history teachers employ to assess students' learning outcomes in the subject?
4. What learning styles do history students use in the learning of history?
5. What perceptions do history teachers have of the teaching of the subject?
6. What perceptions do history students have of the learning of the subject?

### **Significance of the Study**

Firstly, the findings of the study will add to the existing literature and also provide information for further research. Secondly, the findings will alert history teachers on the need to adopt interactive techniques relevant to the subject and to create a stimulating environment when teaching history.

The findings will also alert history teachers on the importance of instructional resources for the effective teaching of the subject, and the need to adopt appropriate instruments for assessing students' learning outcomes in the subject. In addition, the outcomes of the study will help history students to adopt appropriate styles in learning the subject.

The findings will also prompt history teachers and students on the need to have positive perceptions to enhance the teaching and learning of the subject. Ultimately, the study will contribute to the efforts to improve the teaching and learning of history in Ghana's Senior High Schools. Data provided by the study could be of benefit to the Curriculum Research and Development Division (CRDD) of the Ministry of Education, in its efforts to support the teaching and learning of history under the current educational reforms.

### **Delimitation of the Study**

The study was confined to Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana. The scope of the problem was limited to curriculum evaluation with emphasis on the implementation of the 2007 history syllabus. Data collected were on issues related to the transaction of the history curriculum. The study did not concern itself with the extent to which the

objectives of the subject have or have not been achieved. It was a formative type of evaluation since the programme was in its second year of implementation.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of the study were mainly a function of the instruments used to collect data. Since the questionnaire required them to rate their professionalism, teachers could fake unwarranted skills. Students' responses could be influenced by fear, hatred, love and other emotional issues about their teachers. The effect of these could significantly affect the authenticity of the findings.

It is unethical in research to observe people without their knowledge. Hence the researcher sought the consent of the teachers observed in the study. The result of this observance of ethics in research could lead to a 'hawthorne effect': when people are aware that they are being observed, they tend to fake behaviours. Therefore, some teachers might have faked behaviours which could also affect the validity of the findings. There was the tendency that the researcher might be influenced by some personal factors to assign specific ratings to those characteristics observed. This was because the observation was done by the researcher alone.

The exclusion of teacher perception of teaching and student perception of learning history from the study objectives might not bring out the total perception of history. If there has been a cross analysis of the perceptions in terms of teaching and learning of history from the point of view of both

students and teachers, the study would have brought out a clearer picture of the phenomenon.

### **Organisation of the Study**

This research has been organised under five major chapters. Chapter one deals with the background introduction to the topic. It also covers statement of the problem, purpose of the study as well as research questions. Other areas covered in the chapter are significance of the study, delimitation and limitations of the study.

Chapter two deals with the review of theoretical issues and empirical studies related to the study. It covers such areas as theoretical framework, other types of evaluation, the senior high school history syllabus, learning styles, perceptions and related studies on curriculum evaluation.

Chapter three looks at the research design and procedures adopted for the study. It describes the population of the study, the sample and sampling procedures, the instruments for data collection, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Chapter four presents and discusses the results of the study. Chapter five is devoted to the summary, conclusions and recommendations as well as areas for further research.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews theoretical issues and empirical studies related to the study. The empirical review was done for the purpose of comparing the findings of this study with other related studies to either confirm or repudiate conclusions drawn by early researchers.

The review is organized under the following headings:

1. Theoretical framework.
2. Other types of evaluation.
3. The senior high school history syllabus.
4. Learning styles.
5. Perception
6. Related studies on curriculum evaluation.

#### Theoretical Framework

The study is designed within the framework of interactive and formative evaluation. Before describing the theoretical framework in detail, it is germane to explain the concept 'curriculum evaluation' within which the theoretical framework itself is located.

### **The Concept ‘Curriculum Evaluation’**

Curriculum evaluation is derived from the two educational words ‘curriculum’ and ‘evaluation’. The word 'curriculum' has no single definition. Instead, there are many competing definitions, and failure to arrive at an agreement has frequently diverted important discussion into semantic dispute. The term ‘curriculum’ has been defined by many people based on their orientations and the philosophy they share. Tanner and Tanner (1995) define the term ‘curriculum’ as a “plan or program of all experiences which the learner encounters under the direction of a school” (p.158). Gatawa (1990) also defines the term as “the totality of the experiences of children for which the schools are responsible” (p.8). These two definitions imply that the curriculum is a series of planned courses to be taken by students. Therefore, the curriculum can be considered as specifying the general aims and objectives of an educational programme and indicating the content, learning experiences and how they will be taught and evaluated.

Like curriculum, the term evaluation has a great variety of meanings (Taba, 1962), with each definition given to suit a particular discipline or context. In the context of the school, evaluation is the gathering of data about the instructional process with the aim of making judgment about the programme. Taba (1962) in a similar sense, sees evaluation as “a process which includes a careful gathering of evidence of the attainment of objectives, a forming of judgments on the basis of that evidence, and a weighing of that evidence in the light of the objectives” (p.130). This implies that a major activity involved in all evaluation is the gathering of data to make judgment on

the extent to which objectives have been achieved. This definition points to objectives-based evaluation. Another definition given by Hagedorn (1976) represents a perspective of decision-oriented evaluation. Hagedorn (1976) defines evaluation as “a systematic set of data collection and analysis of activities undertaken to determine the value of a program to aid management, program planning, staff training, public accountability, and promotion” (p. 414). Stake’s (1972) definition also represents an evaluation that is responsive in nature. He defines evaluation as a collection of data to respond to audience need for information (Quoted in Stenhouse, 1975, p. 114).

It is clear from the above that the term ‘curriculum evaluation’ will not lend itself to a single definition. Harris (1963) sees curriculum evaluation as a systematic process of gathering evidence regarding the changes in students’ behaviour that accompany planned educational experiences (cited in Wells, 1987, p.182). Stufflebeam (1971) also explains that educational evaluation is “the process of delineating, obtaining and providing useful information for judging alternatives” (p.43). Two key issues come up in the definitions. First, curriculum evaluation involves making judgments about the effectiveness of curricula and whether they are meeting the needs of students. Second, it involves gathering information in order to determine how well the curriculum is performing. Thus, the main purpose of curriculum evaluation is the determination of the effectiveness of students learning in relation to the curriculum. Wells (1987) further outlines the purposes of curriculum evaluation as follows:



1. to construct and interpret a reasonably clear overall view of what happened in a learning programme, and to compare this with curriculum intentions;
2. to identify relative strengths and weaknesses as a basis for further curriculum experiences;
3. to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum in preparing learners to undertake particular functions;
4. to identify changes in learners' abilities arising from their curriculum experiences;
5. to delineate accountability of teachers and educational managers and
6. to aid management decision making about justification of resource expenditure (p.183).

Curriculum evaluation occurs throughout all stages of the development and implementation of the curriculum. It is to facilitate accountability to the professions, society, the education facilities and the learners. Curriculum evaluation has both formative and summative flavour, in that it helps in the improvement and termination or continuation of the curriculum. It is also important to note that anything about the curriculum can be evaluated (Taba, 1962).

### **Interactive and Formative Evaluation**

As indicated earlier, the interactive and formative types of evaluation form the theoretical basis of the study. Interactive evaluation is geared towards programme delivery and improvement with some or all aspects of a programme. Owen and Rogers (1999) believe that with this type of evaluation,

there is the notion that each programme initiative is new and it should be regarded as an innovation from the perspective of those involved in its delivery. This means the necessity of this evaluation is to help in the programme delivery. This is because findings of this type of evaluation help programme staff to understand the entirety of the programme and further assist with the implementation of the programme. Here the evaluator may observe what is happening, thereby assisting participants in making judgments about the success or otherwise of programme initiative with a view of future planning (Owen & Rogers, 1999). They again outline four main issues concerned with interactive evaluation:

1. the provision of systematic evaluation finding through which providers can make decisions about future direction of their programmes;
2. assistance in planning and carrying out self evaluations;
3. focusing evaluation on programme change and improvement, in most cases on a continuous basis;
4. a perspective that evaluation can be an end in itself, as a means of empowering providers and participants.

Typical issues addressed in interactive evaluation include what the programme is trying to achieve, how it is delivered, and whether programme delivery is consistent with programme plan (Owen & Rogers, 1999). In addressing these issues the evaluator may adopt any of the following approaches:

1. Responsive approach – This involves the documentation or illumination of the delivery of a programme, and it is more oriented towards the information requirement of programme providers.

2. Action research approach – This involves determining whether or not innovatory approaches to delivery are making a difference.
3. Quality review approach – This also involves the provision of system level guidelines within which providers have a large amount of control over the evaluation agenda.
4. Development approach – This involves working closely with programme providers on a continuous improvement process, often on programmes that are innovatory and unique.
5. Empowerment approach – This involves assisting programme providers and participants to develop and evaluate their own programme (Owen & Rogers, 1999).

In its pure form, interactive evaluation works like the formative evaluation proposed by Scriven (1967) since evaluators provide information for the purpose of programme improvement.

Scriven (1967) posits that formative evaluation takes place before and/or during programme development or implementation. It provides information for programme improvement, modification, documentation and management. The intent is mainly to strengthen the programme by providing feedback on its implementation, progress and success. Thus, it is designed to help the programme to its destination, to influence or help to change programme objectives (Silver, 2004). This type of evaluation is useful for all programmes, but it is especially appropriate for those lasting for several years. In the school system, formative evaluation normally takes the form of class test and exercise, which enable teachers identify problems for remediation.

The choice of interactive and formative evaluation as a framework for the study was informed by the need for action within two time frames. The first one involved immediate action while the other is long term. The immediate action is to provide data for improving the teaching and learning of history in senior high schools. The long term goal is to assist history teachers to undertake what Owen and Rogers (1999) describe as systematic enquiry, encompassing the application of logic and evidence-based decision-making for programme improvement.

### **Other Types of Evaluation**

The interactive and formative types of evaluation which form the framework for the study, and which have been described in the preceding section, are two of the many types of evaluation. Other types available to the curriculum evaluator are described below.

#### **Proactive Evaluation**

As the name suggests, this evaluation type is conducted before a programme is designed or implemented. Thus, it involves judging alternatives or strategies before a programme or project development. It usually calls for review of literature in the area of interest in order to make informed decisions. As Owen and Rogers put it, proactive evaluation is concerned with “synthesizing what is known in the existing research and related literature about an identified issue or problem” and “critically reviewing ways in which an identified issue or problem has been solved through programs mounted in other locations” (p.170). In the design of curricula and within the context of

the classroom, it can be likened to needs assessment or diagnostic evaluation. Just as proactive evaluation augments programme development, needs assessment leads to the establishment of goals, objectives, programme content, resources and requirements. Accordingly, Owen and Rogers (1999) posit that the main purpose of the proactive evaluation is to provide evidence to aid the synthesis of programmes. Considering the complex nature of curriculum development coupled with the limited skills of developers, it may be argued that proactive evaluation helps reduce the risk of producing poor quality or ineffective materials as well as the likelihood of negative evaluation.

### **Clarificative Evaluation**

According to Owen and Rogers (1999), clarificative evaluation elucidates programme intents for easy implementation. Thus, it helps to decide on the best way to organize a project or programme. It usually operates on a logic which lay bare solutions to some of the problems associated with results-based methodologies. Clarificative evaluation abandons the focus on results in order to study and make clear underlying assumptions in a programme in question. The rationale for such an undertaking is somewhat simple: programmes may fail either because of problems related to their implementation or because the logic on which they were built was wrong in some way. This evaluation therefore clarifies such issues during programme implementation.

### **Monitoring Evaluation**

Monitoring evaluation is the least acknowledged in literature, but undoubtedly the most practised category of evaluation- activity in most organizations. According to Shapiro (1996) “monitoring is the systematic collection and analysis of information as a project progresses” (p.3). Similarly, Owen and Rogers (1999) state that monitoring evaluation is best conducted when a programme is established and on-going. It, therefore, aims at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a project or organization (Shapiro, 1996). Thus, monitoring evaluation helps to keep project works on track, and can let management know when things are going wrong.

### **Impact Evaluation**

Impact evaluation happens to be the most comprehensive and often undertaken among all the forms of evaluation by organizations and institutions. Silver (2004) posits that impact evaluation assesses the changes in institutions that can be attributed to a particular programme or policy. Impact evaluation is, therefore, the methodical identification of effects either positive or negative, intended or not on institutions and the environment caused by a given development activity such as a programme or project (World Bank, 2004). Such an evaluation is desirable because it focuses on long-range results of a programme, including changes and improvement (National Cancer Institute, 1992). Thus, it aims at providing feedback on projects or programmes and helps improve the effectiveness of programmes and projects. In this case, it serves as a decision-making tool for programme developers and policy makers. This evaluation has the advantage of providing

systematic analysis and detailed results that can give programme developers an added confidence on decision-making.

### **Objective-based Evaluation**

The objectives-based model of curriculum evaluation is also known in evaluation literature as the performance-objectives congruence approach. According to Tyler (1949), this evaluation is used to “determine the extent to which the educational objectives are actually being realized by the programme of curriculum and instruction” (p.106). Generally speaking, this model is a process for determining the degree of congruence between behaviour and objectives after instruction. The model was set up largely to focus on outcome behaviours and it is a logical progression to attempt to measure and quantify these outcome behaviours. It is, therefore, accepted as a model restricted to outcome behaviours or product.

The technique used in objectives-based studies basically involves specifying operational objectives and collecting and analyzing pertinent information to determine how well each objective was achieved. Cobbold (1999) also considers the technique involved and says that “broad goals or objectives are established or identified, defined in behavioural terms and relevant student behaviours are measured against this yardstick using either standardized or evaluator-constructed instruments” (p.40). In order to check this, it requires some measures or indicators of the programme or project towards its goals. The evaluation information leads to curriculum modification, clarification of objectives, and reconstruction of teaching methods.

### **Goal-free Evaluation**

At the polar end of the objectives-based evaluation model is goal-free evaluation proposed by Scriven (1972). According to Stecher (1991), “Goal-free evaluation is an approach to evaluation in which merit is determined from an examination of program effect without reference to form or objectives” (p.13). Cobbold (1999) also has it that the model “determines the merit of the programme by examining the actual effects of the programme, whether intended or not, without reference to its stated goals or objectives” (p.45). In other words, the process involves determining the merit of any programme by comparing programme performance profile to a profile of needs. Stecher (1991) attests that the model is a philosophical principle for finding the evaluation process, and argues that in such a case it depends on the professional skill of the evaluator to discover and document programme outcomes in order to make meaningful evaluations. The evaluator within this model is therefore totally independent of observed effects that can be attributed to the programme under investigation.

### **Decision-Oriented Evaluation**

Decision-oriented evaluation is also referred to as the Decision-management approach. The essence of this evaluation is the collection and analysis of information about educational or training programmes for the purpose of decision-making. The main assumption underlying this approach is the idea that evaluation is worthwhile only if its result affects future actions (Lewy, 1977). Thus, this evaluation framework tends to serve as an informational need for decision-makers and administrators.



### **Responsive Evaluation**

Responsive evaluation is a disciplined form of evaluation proposed by Stake (1972), which results in qualitative evidence. It has a vision and rationale for evaluation. According to Abma (2005), the vision is reframed from the assessment of programme interventions on the basis of policy makers' goals to an engagement with all stakeholders about the effectiveness of their practice. Responsive evaluation focuses on re-directing data gathering and interpretative endeavours around emerging issues of importance to programme practitioners and other stakeholders in the evaluation setting (Stake, 1972).

This evaluation approach is useful during formative evaluation when staff needs help in monitoring a programme, when no one is sure what problems will arise; and particularly in summative evaluation when stakeholders want an understanding of a programme's activities, especially its strengths and weaknesses.

### **Summative Evaluation**

On summative evaluation, Scriven (1967) indicates that the approach takes place after the completion of a programme or project and it involves considering the project or programme as a whole, from the beginning to the end. What is implied here is that, it is not just something that happens at the end of the project, it thus summarizes the whole process, describes its destination, and though it may have insights into impact, it is not concerned solely with impact (Silver, 2004). This type of evaluation measures the extent to which the programme's stated goals and objectives were achieved and

determines any unintended consequences of the programme and whether these were positive or negative. Silver (2004), shares the same view here, that summative evaluation is associated with the identification of the present objectives and judgment as to their achievement. The chief intent of this evaluation type is to summarize and inform decisions on whether to continue a programme (or part of it), whether it is valuable to expand into other settings or terminate the whole programme. Relating it to the classroom setting, summative evaluation takes the form of end-of-term examination.

On the issue of difference, it is accepted that there is no clear cut difference between formative and summative evaluations. In other words, we can accept that there is a thin line between the two. Even Scriven himself accepted that there are no basic logical and methodological differences between the two (Cobbold, 1999). Lewy (1999) shares the view that the timing and the people demanding its results make an evaluation formative or summative. Hopkins (1989), even attested earlier that what the information accrued from the evaluation process is use for indicates a difference between the two evaluation approaches. In a very comical statement, (Hopkins, 1989) suggests that formative evaluation is when the cook tastes the soup, and summative evaluation is when the guest tastes it. This means that at the formative stage, if the cook realises that the taste of the soup is not good, he/she may either make a new one or add what is lacking. This goes with formative evaluation which is concerned with modifications.

### **Countenance Evaluation**

In 1967, Robert Stake proposed the “countenance model” of evaluation. He argued: “My attempt here is to introduce a conceptualization of evaluation oriented to the complex and dynamic nature of education, one which gives proper attention to the diverse purposes and judgments of the practitioner” (p.2). In light of this, the countenance evaluation can be accepted as a process of describing and judging the merit of an educational programme. Stake identifies the basic characteristics of evaluation as including the evaluation acts (description and judgment in evaluation), the data source, the congruence and contingencies, the standards, and uses of evaluation.

In Stake’s words, “Both description and judgment are essential – in fact, they are the two basic acts of evaluation” (1967, p.3). He, therefore, concludes that “To be fully understood, the educational programme must be fully described and fully judged (1967, p.3). Thus, judgment data and description data are both important to the evaluation of educational programmes.

It is clear from the models discussed, that they present similarities and differences in ways that people approach curriculum evaluation. Most of the models have a similar conceptual philosophy, only their definitions put them on a parallel. In any case, they all bring to the fore various means of evaluation.

## **The Senior High School History Syllabus**

It is required of evaluators to describe clearly what it is that they are evaluating. Here, I address myself to this role, starting with the concept of a syllabus.

In simple terms Burston (1972) defines a syllabus as “a statement of the contents of a subject which it is proposed to study: it is also a statement of the order in which it is proposed to study those contents” (p.109). Burston’s definition leaves out a lot of elements found in the syllabus by way of recognising only the content. The definition therefore represents a parochial view of the syllabus. In more comprehensive terms, a syllabus may be defined as an outline specifying the rationale, aims and objectives, contents, teaching methods, teaching-learning resources and assessment instruments of a particular subject, packaged in the school curriculum.

The senior high school history syllabus, the object of this evaluative study, provides such an outline. The essential elements are described below.

### **Rationale**

Pratt (1980) defines the rationale of an instructional programme as “an argument that seeks to justify the pursuit of an aim” (p. 152). This means that the rationale presents the need for which a course is taught. This usually encompasses assumptions about the society, students and areas of study of a particular subject. It also indicates the benefits that learners will derive from studying the subject (Pratt, 1980). Succinctly, the rationale is the philosophical base of a subject. That is, the synthesizing of all pertinent knowledge and ideas which determine the chief ends and values of a subject (Taba, 1962).

With regard to the history syllabus, the subject is designed to equip student with skill, knowledge, attitudes and values that will enable them fit into the ever-changing global village. It is envisaged that the history programme will enhance the development of the spirit of patriotism, critical thinking and national awareness through appreciation of the past. The subject is, therefore, designed to enable the student to study the past, use the knowledge acquired to appreciate the present, and by so doing, build a better future.

### **Aims and Objectives**

The aims and objectives of a syllabus provide a basic orientation for the teacher or curriculum implementer. According to Taba (1962), the aims and objectives of a course are statements of expected or desired outcomes of an educational enterprise. Thus, the aims and objectives represent a clear idea of what teachers should achieve after instruction (Nacino, Oke & Brown, 1990).

The aims and objectives of the senior high school history syllabus are to help students:

1. acquire the skill of gathering and objectively analyzing historical data that will enable them interpret the actions and behaviours of the people of Ghana from a Ghanaian perspective.
2. acquire more detailed study of the history of the people of Ghana from ancient times to date.
3. study some other African civilizations with the aim of appreciating among other things, the advancements made in earlier ages.

4. appreciate the need for interdependence of societies to be able to relate events in Ghana to those of the outside world.
5. develop a sense of national consciousness and appreciate the factors that make for national and international unity.
6. acquire positive habits and attitudes, national identity as a Ghanaian and an African with a heritage worthy of pride, preservation and improvement
7. appreciate the relevance of the study of history in current and future
8. development efforts of the nation (Ghana Education Service, 2008, p.ii).

From the above, the history subject is intended to provide an integrative education with the aim of training people who could use intellectual foundation to earn a good life. The history subject is, therefore, seen as a sequel to the junior high school social studies subject. Also, the subject aims at helping students to carry out their responsibilities as citizens of Ghana and as Africans.

### **Content**

Generally, instructional programme content represents the themes in a particular subject. In a stricter sense, the content is the subject matter to be taught in a subject area. It usually reflects the perspective of the discipline, especially the philosophical inclinations. In the syllabus, the content is arranged in topics form.

The content of the history syllabus comprises the landmarks of Africa history up to 1800, cultures and civilizations of Ghana from earliest times to

AD 1700 and history of Ghana and her relations with the wider world from AD 1500 to the present. Under the landmarks of African history, the following topics are expected to be treated:

1. History as a subject (introduction to African history)
2. African Pre- history from the earliest time to 500 BC.
3. Civilization of Pharaonic Egypt, from 3000B.C.
4. Civilization of Axum and Ancient Ethiopia.
5. Civilization of North Africa.
6. Origin and spread of Bantu Civilization.
7. Swahili civilization of East African Coast.
8. Civilization of the West African Sudan from 500 B.C.
9. Civilization and Cultures of the West African forest and coast.

Regarding the Cultures and Civilizations of Ghana from earliest times to AD 1700, the following topics have been outlined for study at year three.

1. Introduction to the History of Ghana
2. Pre- history of Ghana: 50,000B.C to AD 700
3. The Peopling of Ghana
4. Social and Political Organisations
5. History of Medicine
6. History of the Economy of Ghana
7. Rise of States and Kingdoms
8. History of Art and Technology
9. The Coming of the Europeans.

The history of Ghana and her relation with the wider world from AD 1500 to the present also deals with the following topics

1. Social and Political developments: 1500-1900.
2. Social, Economic and Political developments in Ghana: AD 1900 – 1957
3. Independence and after: The Nkrumah Era.
4. Ghana after the Nkrumah Era 1966 – 1991.
5. Ghana in the Comity of Nations.

Clearly, the content of the syllabus is intended to help students learn about the history of Ghana, Africa and the World as an important step in building national and patriotic feelings that will enable learners to use the lessons of history in planning for the present and the future of the country

### **Teaching Methods**

Teaching methods are the most important instruments employed by teachers to realize the objectives of a lesson. Thus, teachers of all disciplines including history use teaching methods as a vehicle for achieving lesson objectives. Tamakloe, Amedahe and Atta (2005) explain that teaching methods are “the process which are adopted by both the teacher and the students to induce learning in the teaching learning interaction” (p.346). Thus, teaching methods are the processes through which learning takes place.

Contemporary educational theories in educational philosophy and most especially educational psychology have been in support of teaching methods that are learner centred. In this light, Kelly (1989) comments that educational process is entirely educational only if students are active within it. Invariably, learning becomes more effective when methods used are learner centred. However, it may be observed that in almost all history lessons in Ghana the



main teaching method in the classrooms is the lecture method, normally accompanied with note-taking and silent reading followed with questions. These activities are usually methods, which Crookall (1975) opines, are bad ways of teaching history. Nonetheless, the nature of the subject history demands that teachers use an array of teaching methods to achieve the purpose for which history is taught, which of course is the ability to think critically. Such methods will enable students to test, question, explore and challenge the construction of historical knowledge (Mathew, 1966). Lerner (1997) states: “a meaningful connection to the past demands, above all, active engagement” (Quoted in Germanou, 2007, p.21). Active engagement has not been the hallmark of history education in almost all parts of the world. It is only through active intellectual engagement with the past that learners are able to build their own understanding and think critically regarding the constructions of others (Davis, 2005, quoted in Germanou, 2007, p.21). Pertaining to the methods of teaching, it is stipulated in the syllabus that the following methods be used in the teaching of the subject: discussion, question and answer, lecture, project method, brainstorming, field trip and debates. Such methods will invariably help learners to put historical events into proper categories, compare and contrast against others, thereby developing in learners the act of critical thinking.

Urnstated (1964) describes the lecture method of teaching as an uninterrupted verbal presentation by an instructor. It is highly one way, monotonous, directive and encourages passivity. As a result of these characteristics of the lecture method, Ramsden (1992) attests that very little of the information received through the lecture method is retained by students.

Thus the mental state of students in any typical history class is very passive and information washes over them, without penetrating. Francis and Bryne (1999, p.206) also attest that “Abundant research shows that students taught in conventional lectures, even those who perform very well in conventional assessment, are often quite unable to apply their knowledge effectively in real world situations”. This makes Crookall (1975) classify the lecture method as a bad way of teaching history.

However, the technique in its stricter sense offers opportunities for an instructor to explain a particularly equivocal point of idea, or a complicated, difficult, abstract process or operation. That is, unnecessary obstacles to learning are removed when the lecture method is used in teaching. The advantages of the lecture method as an instructional technique is acquiescent to some of the broad objectives of a lesson, namely: widening the horizons of students; helping in understanding and discovery of self in relation to their own culture and the larger world; and finally reducing anxiety on the part of beginners. As Kimble and Makaechie (1960) point out, the lecture method meets the dependency needs of the students who are especially dependent at the beginning of a course.

The discussion method is a democratic process of reconstructing knowledge and it involves an entire class in an extended interchange of ideas between the teacher and the learner and concurrently among fellow learners (Kam-Fai, 1973). Myers (1986) posits that discussion is used frequently because it helps to engage learners’ interest, challenging their present thinking process and creating the atmosphere where active reflection and interchange replace caution and passivity. This is largely because the teacher typically

relies on the learners to provide ideas, experiences, opinions, and information during lesson development. It therefore develops facility in oral expression, creative and critical thinking, intellectual and imaginative problem-solving ability. However, this method is not frequently used in history lessons but rather the rigid lecture method which according to Odamtten (1993) makes the subject sterile.

Best associated with the Greek scholar, Socrates, the question and answer method is an instructional procedure where a teacher explores the implications of students' position, to stimulate rational thinking and illuminate ideas. In simple terms, the instructor asks questions in the classroom that demand responses from learners. This method stimulates thought in a sense that when the mind hears a question, then the thinking becomes that of solving a problem. This instructional technique is rated as a good tool that teachers use to evaluate learners' knowledge on a topic and teachers often use it to help learners who need improvement in the classroom since by soliciting answers to key questions the teacher gains some insight into the class progress. The method also gives students the opportunity to research and inquiry on a topic (Anti & Anum, 2003).

According to Mayers (2003) the discovery method is an instructional technique that inspires students to take an active role in the teaching and learning process by answering a series of questions or solving problems designed to introduce a general concept. Gellenstien (2004) is therefore, of the view that the method was developed based on the notion that learning takes place through classification and schema formation. Succinctly, this approach is at variance with the lecture method which encourages rote learning. On this

wave length, Francis and Bryne (1999) concur that learners thought in conventional lectures tend to rote-learn by failing to integrate their new knowledge into their prior assumptions, and they rarely think through the implications of what they learn. Even recent research indicates that history is learnt most effectively when learners are engaged in the process of discovery and interpretation of historical topics (Cameron & Debra, 2000).

Role play, according to Manoron and Pollock (2006), is a teaching technique that involves learners actively in the learning process by enabling them to act as stakeholders in an imagined or real scenario. Thus, the approach develops a greater understanding of the complexity of professional practice and enables learners to develop skills to engage in multi-stakeholder negotiations within the controlled environment of the classroom. Manorom and Pollock (2006), therefore, attest that the role play technique allows learners to apply concepts and problems that have been introduced through lectures and readings to a situation that reflects reality. It also helps in embedding concepts into the long term memory of learners since it allows learners to be actively involved in lessons (Manorom & Pollock, 2006).

Dramatization as a teaching method assists students to assume real life situation during lesson delivery. Learners entering into a drama class have the opportunity to freely question, pretend, and imagine within the context of historical or cultural knowledge. Learners are, therefore, compelled to explore themes, times periods and identify objectives as well as look for turning points in events. Aside primary sources, Weatherly (1989) is of the view that learners can use biographies to recreate historical figures in the classroom. Principally, dramatization is use to teach historical events, that represent life in another

period or demonstrate some problems of living and to enhance growth of a movement or ideas (Annobil, 2004).

Brainstorming is a teaching approach that is used to generate new, useful ideas, and promoting creative thinking (Cullen, 1998). In addition, it helps in making connections between ideas. In a classroom situation, brainstorming is often used in teaching critical thinking skills. Thus, it is an appropriate tool for the teaching of history since the teaching of history has been to develop critical thinkers. The method also tends to explore an individual's knowledge and experiences during lesson delivery.

Nacino, Oke and Brown (1990) are of the view that field trips are places where learners are taken to in order to see in practice or reality what they have studied in class. Implying here is the idea that field trips are undertaken for learners to see or experience what they have been taught in theory. This approach provides first hand learning experiences, makes learning more meaningful and lasting and also provides an opportunity for improving social relationship among students and between students and teachers (Tamakloe, et al., 2005; Awuah, 2000). This develops in history students acts of creativity and critical thinking, since they discover many things which might not have been accomplished in the normal classroom work (Tamakloe et al., 2005). However, many teachers think that such method of teaching is time wasting and lacks purpose (Tamakloe, et al., 2005). Adeyinka (1990) is also of the view that adequate funds are not usually available for excursion and educational visits. Teachers, therefore, tend to reject the field trip method and the other methods requiring heavy financial provisions.

Jagger (2000) contends that debates are effective methods of enabling learners to take active part in their own classroom learning through presentation of lessons. According to Jagger (2000), “This supports pedagogic theory which has concluded that students learn effectively when they learn cooperatively, through interaction with others, facilitating and developing critical thinking skills” (p.2). Thus, the method develops the faculty of analytical reasoning. According Jagger (2000), debate happens to be a good method for the teaching of history, because it deals with the interpretation of facts and accounts of events and more importantly, develops critical thinking skills by the polarity of view points on a particular topic, promoting the understanding of alternative perspectives from strong facts base.

### **Teaching and Learning Resources**

Teaching-learning resources are the primary vehicles for delivering content knowledge to students. These resources which include audio materials, visual materials and audio-visual materials, to a large extent, determine what students do learn and do not learn. The California Department of Education (2003) supports the view that instructional resources are particularly important because they are the primary means through which learners gain access to the knowledge and skills specified in the syllabus. With respect to history teaching, the California Department (2003) contends that history teaching is presented as a story well told, with continuity and narrative coherence, and based on the best recent evidence. They, therefore, attest that instructional resources such as documents and photographs should be incorporated into the narratives to present the account in a vivid picture of the time. The American

National Council of Social Studies (1994), The American Center for History in Schools (1996) and recently, The American Historical Association (2003) have all recognized the importance of history teachers using instructional resources in the classroom. The literature on best practice in the history classroom encourages the use of instructional materials to support historical inquiry (Sexias, 2000; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988).

Given these high stakes with regard to the importance of instructional resources, their availability and quality are urgent and require responses (Oakes & Saunders, 2002). Jarolimick and Foster (1989) in a similar sense, attest that in any learning environment there must be quantity of good quality resources suitable for diverse range of learning styles. Bruce (1987) has on the basis of greater availability of instructional resources indicated that their availability results in the quality of learning activities, perhaps increasing learners' performance.

The history syllabus recommends the provision of specific resources for the effective execution of each topic in the syllabus. These include: textbooks, visual aids such as maps, charts and pictures, audio-visual aids such as films and the use of museums as well as resource persons. Indeed, the use of these resources will enhance the teaching and learning of history whose very nature is abstract. Tamakloe et al. (2005) also share the view that such resources are generally suitable for class teaching than individual teaching.

The history textbook is central to the teaching and learning of history. It provides detailed information on the topics outlined in the history syllabus. "Research evidence indicates that textbooks are ubiquitous and widely used in classroom" (Woodward & Elliot, 1990, p.178). Adeyinka (1990) affirms this

by stating that textbooks are the most common aids for teaching history. History textbooks are, therefore, the primary tools that teachers use to organize their lessons and make content knowledge and skills available to students (Oakes & Saunders, 2002).

Equally important and recommended is audio materials such as radio, tape recorders, cassette players, disc players among others. These instructional resources communicate information through the sense of hearing. Tamakloe et al, (2005) indicate that such instructional resources are suitable for class teaching than individual teaching. In this sense, historical speeches can be played for students to get what was actually said by great figures in history, which in a sense appeals to all the senses of the students (Farrant, 1980).

Another important type of instructional resource is visual materials such as maps, charts, atlases, pictures, among others. This category of resources conveys information through the sense of sight. Such instructional materials ensure effective teaching and learning of history since they give a clear picture of past events to students.

Audio-visual materials also form another major type of the instructional resources used for the teaching and learning of history. According Tamakloe et al, (2005) audio-visual materials are those, which cater for both audio and visual perceptions. Instructional resources that fall into this category include television, slide projectors and film strips. These resources are most important in the teaching and learning of history because they help to make events that took place long ago look real to students and indeed reduce the abstract nature of the teaching of history.



With respect to resources centres, Ghana has museums, archives centres and other historical sites that teachers and students can visit to acquire first hand information. Such resources centres enable students to see in reality what they have been taught in class. They, therefore, provide students with first hand learning experiences make learning more meaningful and lasting and also give opportunity for improving social relationship among students and between students and teachers (Tamakloe, et al., 2005; Awuah, 2000). It appears, however, that students are not often taken to these centres because of time constraints. It can also be that there are not enough funds to support the visits to these learning centres. The influence of tests and standards that pay little attention to historical skills have also been identified by several researchers as a problem that prevent teachers from taking students to historical sites (Grant, 2000; Grant, Gradwell, Lauricella, Pullano & Tzetzso, 2002). This is simply because most teachers want to prepare their students for examinations and not the acquisition of 'real' historical knowledge.

Resource persons are also important instructional resources recommended in the syllabus. Resource persons are people with expert knowledge in certain specific areas than teachers. They are often invited to teach certain topics that they are well grounded in. The use of resource persons in the teaching of history helps make the teaching practical and efficient since mostly they are practitioners on the field. The approach also helps to break the monotony of students often seeing and hearing their teacher (Crandall & Associate, 1982). The above discussed instructional resources are the major types recommended in the history syllabus for effective teaching and learning of the subject.

## Assessment Instruments

Assessment is an integral part in the teaching and learning of history that challenges history teachers to consider variety of assessment instruments that would meet the learning needs of the history subject. The American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, and National Education Association (1990) see assessment as a process for obtaining information required for making decisions about students, curricula and programmes, and educational policy (Quoted in Nitko, 2004, p.4). In the definition, it is established that assessment has to do with the process of gaining information about students' learning (Gronlund, 1996). It can, therefore, be said that assessment is a process of determining how much a student has learnt the materials covered in class in a broader way (Dobson-Lewis, 2008).

In assessing students' learning outcomes in history, it has been recommended in the syllabus that teachers make use of the following: projects which should take the form of practical work, experiments and investigative study. The others include class test, class exercise, home work and term examination. Here, the syllabus leaves out other forms such as individual and group presentations as well as case studies. These forms help improve the language of history students since history as a subject demands the use of standard English. The assessment instruments recommended in the syllabus are discussed under broad headings as traditional, alternative, performance and authentic assessment instruments.

First, there is the traditional assessment instrument, otherwise called the paper-and-pencil test, which primarily emphasizes knowledge learning

rather than skills (Gronlund, 2003; Dobson-Lewis, 2008). Commonly, this applies to exams, test and other selected response assessments (multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank statements and the popular true and false items). However, the teaching of history is a complex task and the assumption that historical knowledge can be broken down into bits to make it teachable, comprehensible and assessable no longer holds (Dobson-Lewis, 2008). As Grundy (1987) states, the notion that atomistic pieces of learning can be identified and measured is an assumption that trivializes the teaching and learning of history. Thus, the use of objective type of test to measure the bit and pieces of historical knowledge is no more useful. This assessment instrument is often criticized for focusing on the disconnectedness between the limited range of skills taught in the classroom and what the student will face in the 'real world'. The ways in which teachers evaluate students is open to criticism on these grounds, as lacking validity and reliability. This brings to light the use of alternative, performance and authentic assessment instruments in assessing 'real' historical knowledge.

An alternative assessment instrument is an important form of assessment that is recommended in the teaching and learning of history. Hancock (1994) defines this assessment instrument as "an ongoing process involving the students and the teacher in making judgments about students' progress in language, using non-conventional strategies" (p.2). This is usually the use of individual presentation in class to help improve the language of history students since history as a subject demands the use of standard English. Others include project work, concept maps, case study, documentary reports and group presentations (Dobson-Lewis, 2008). Gronlund (2006) has

affectionately referred to it as an assessment that provides an alternative to paper-and-pencil test (traditional assessment). Biggs (1999) opines that “students learn what they think they will be tested on” (p.141). This in effect, is why alternative assessment instruments are needed in order to use it as a means of improving learning (Dobson-Lewis, 2008). Alternative assessment practices, therefore, work in favour of finding out what students know, and not just what they do not know.

Performance assessment also represents another important assessment instrument. In his opinion, Gronlund (2006) sees performance assessment as the assessment that behooves students to demonstrate their achievements of understanding and skills by performing a task or set of tasks such as giving a speech in a form of presentation or conducting an experiment. Major forms recommended in the syllabus include home work, investigative study, experimental work, among others. This type of assessment focuses on students’ cognitive and the other domains, and their ability to produce something to demonstrate their learning (Heywood, 2000).

Mention is also made of authentic assessment instrument in the assessment literature. Popham (2005) posits that authentic assessment is an “assessment in which the students’ tasks resemble real-life tasks” (p.363). A basis for this assessment instrument in classroom use is the belief that education is not simply a matter of memorization but must be informed by critical thought and connected and applied knowledge. Such assessment, tasks students to examine their strengths and weaknesses and to set their own goals to further their learning. When students make choices in setting goals about their learning, achievement can increase; when choice is absent, achievement

can decrease. “We must constantly remind ourselves that the ultimate purpose of evaluation is to have students become self-evaluating” (Costa & Kallick, 1992, p. 275).

Many researchers therefore advocate an increased use of authentic assessment instruments. Authors such as Karge (1998), Morris (2001), and Prestidge and Glaser (2000) describe a variety of authentic assessment instruments that are intended to increase students’ engagement and make learning more relevant. These include: role play and drama; concept maps; student portfolios; reflective journals; utilizing multiple information sources; group work in which team members design and build models. Authentic assessment provides a measure by which students’ academic growth can be gauged over time while capturing the true depth of student learning and understanding. It moves beyond the practices of traditional tools and tasks and allows for a greater expression of students’ abilities and achievements.

Gronlund (2006) outlines major strengths of the alternative, performance and authentic assessment in teaching higher level subjects like history as:

1. The procedures help evaluate complex outcomes that cannot be evaluated through traditional assessment. This is perfectly true because analysis of historical information cannot be assessed using objective-type of traditional assessment.
2. The procedures also provide a more natural assessment of some types of reasoning such as critical thinking skills in history.

3. Again, the procedures provide greater motivation for students and makes learning of history more meaningful to students. This is because students are more involved in the assessment practice.
4. Finally, the assessment procedures enable the students to produce or work on real-life situations. Thus, such assessment techniques make the learning of history real and therefore reduce its abstract nature.

It important to point out that, this evaluative study will focus on the teaching methods, teaching-learning resources and assessment elements in the syllabus. The reason is that the syllabus has not run its full course since its implementation, so it will be difficult to find out whether such elements as the rationale, aims and objectives of the subject have been achieved, which are worth to be evaluated. Therefore, a focus on the other elements by the study will help provide information about proper delivery of the new syllabus.

### **Learning Styles**

In simple terms, Gagne (1985) defines learning as “a change in human disposition or capacity that persists over a period of time...” (p.2). According to Felder and Silverman (1988), “learning is a two-step process involving the reception and processing of information” (p. 674). They explain that in the reception step, external information (observation through the senses) and internal information (arising introspectively) become available to learners, who select the material they will process and ignore the rest (Felder & Silverman, 1988). It is worthy to note that in the process of learning, there is the memorization or inductive or deductive reasoning, reflection or action, and introspection or interaction with others. The end result is that the material is

either “learned” in one sense or the other or not learned (Felder & Silverman, 1988). In this process, students adopt different styles which have become known in education as learning styles.

Deavler (2007) sees learning styles as the way each student begins to concentrate on, process, internalize and retain new and difficult academic information. The approach the individual student adopts is believed to help the person learn best. Several learning styles inventories have been developed, some by leaders in gifted education (e.g. Barbe, Swassing & Milone, 1979; Renzuli & Smith, 1978). However, an extensive body of research has established that most people learn most effectively with one of the two modalities proposed by Felder and Silverman in 1988 which will be the focus of this study.

### **Auditory and Visual Learning Styles**

Learners who use auditory learning style learn by hearing and listening. They understand and remember things they have heard and they store information by way of its sound. Jonassen and Hodges (1982) attest that learners who use auditory learning style gather information through the sense of hearing. They, therefore, interpret the underlying meaning of information through listening to the tone of voice. Such students of history benefit from reading aloud and using tape recorders. Unavailability of such resources will, therefore, impede on their understanding of historical information. Silverman (2000) contends that auditory learners are higher academic achievers in academic subjects than visual learners. By way of contrast, Silverman (2000)

reports that auditory learners have short term memory because they memorize information easily which they often forget easily.

Visual learning style on the other hand has to do with the approach where learners learn by reading or seeing pictures, and they remember things by sight. Thus, they get information through the words that they see (Jonassen & Hodges, 1982). They often learn best by using methods that are primarily visual and tend to forget what was said (Felder & Silverman, 1988). These learners prefer to see teachers' body language and facial expression to fully understand the content of a lesson, especially when the lecture method is being used. They, therefore, take detailed notes and absorb information. Thus visualization provides the organisational construct for assimilating and processing new ideas for such learners (Silverman, 2000). Silverman further attests that such learners face problems in mastering materials in the normal classroom setting where standard classroom techniques are used. This has been stated in earlier years by Gohm, Humphreys and Yao (1998) that visual learners are more likely than auditory learners to underachieve. However, visual learners do better in artistry, mathematics, engineering and computer sciences courses (Silverman, 2000).

### **Active and Reflective Learning Styles**

According to Felder and Solomon (2000), students who are active learners tend to retain and understand classroom information best by doing something active - by discussing or applying or explaining something to others. Thus, they learn effectively when they are actually engaged in doing something (Breitsprecher, 2005). According to Felder and Silverman (1988),



learners of this nature do not learn in situations that require them to be passive, such as the lecture method and learners tend to like group work (Felder & Solomon , 2000). Such learners also have a strong tendency toward holistic learning than individualistic learning style (Ford, 1985). Felder and Silverman (1988), concludes that active learners are experimentalists and, therefore, in a class where the students are always passive, the active experimenters cannot learn effectively.

Reflective learners on the other hand tend to think about information presented in the classroom quietly (Breitsprecher, 2005). Thus reflective learners do not learn much in situations such as most lectures that provide no chance to think about information being presented in the classroom (Felder and Silverman, 1988). This implies that such students tend to work or learn better by themselves or at most with one other person and they are mostly, theoreticians (Felder and Silverman, 1988; Breitsprecher, 2005). They, therefore, tend to have a strong tendency toward analytical skills and the ability to work alone (Johnson & White, 1981).

Clearly, learners differ from each other in a variety of ways, including the type of instruction to which they respond best (Felder and Brent, 2005). Thus, learners preferably take in and process information in different ways resulting in various learning styles. Considering the diverse styles with which students learn effectively, Felder and Silverman, (1988) and Felder and Brent, (2005), argue that instructional methods used by teachers should address the needs of student across the full spectrum of learning styles. This is necessary because the learning styles of most learners and teaching styles of most teachers are incompatible in several dimensions resulting in ineffective

learning on the part of the learners (Felder and Silverman, 1988). On the other hand, there is much success when teaching methods focus on individuality of learners' learning styles (Whaley and Smyer, 1998). It is, therefore, important for tutors to identify the learners' learning styles in order to use a suitable teaching methods which can lead to an increased comfort and willingness to learn among learners, because when learning styles of most history students and the teaching styles of the teachers are seriously mismatched, the learners are likely to become uncomfortable, bored and inattentive in class, do poorly on tests, get discouraged about the subject, and in some cases drop the subject (Felder & Spurlin, 2005).

### **Perception: Definition and Development**

There is an increasing interest and concern in the role of perception in the teaching and learning of history. Fieldman (1987) explains that, perception is the sorting out, analysis, interpretation and integration of stimuli from the sensory organs. In this direction, it can be accepted as the process through which people receive and interpret sensory stimuli into forms that are understandable. In other words, it is the process by which people give meaning to stimuli (Mumuni, 2006). Perception may include all processes associated with recognition, transformation and organization of sensory information (Little, 1999).

Loftus and Worthmans (1988) in another context see perception as a process by which the brain interprets the sensations it receives by giving them order and meaning. With this definition, it can be said that how one brain interprets sensation will be different from how another does it, because of how

perceptual systems are structured and how a person see the world in terms of knowledge, beliefs and expectations (Loftus & Worthman, 1988). Peoples' perception will therefore be dependent on the way they interprets sensations they receive.

Gibson and Spelke (1983) have identified five stages through which perceptions develop. In the first place, they indicate that, as human beings grow, their perception becomes more selective and more purposeful. Secondly, people become increasingly aware of the meaning of their perceptions. The next stage according to Gibson and Spelke (1983) is when perception becomes more selective as people detect increasingly subtle aspects of stimuli. The fourth stage is where people become more efficient in picking up critical information from stimuli. The final stage is when people become proficient at generalizing perceived meaning from one situation to another. They conclude that, though perceptual development appears continuous, yet the development goes through these stages. It important to point out that such perception influences one's attitude of doing anything. Therefore, the perception of teachers and students will have a great impact on the teaching and learning of history.

### **Related Studies on Curriculum Evaluation**

#### **Teaching Methods**

Several studies have been done to find out the methods history teachers employ in the teaching of the subject. In a study on methods of teaching high school history conducted by Adejunmobi (1978) in Nigeria, the findings showed that with eight-one (81) secondary school history teachers, 74% of the

respondents indicated that they used the lecture method very often. The 'Question and Answer or Socratic method', which implies that pupils spend most of the time in answering questions posed by the teacher, was used often by 37% of the respondents. The 'Group method', which incorporates such other methods as debates, projects and dramatization had only 21% of his respondents indicating that they use it. Adeyinka (1990) reacts that it appears that the external examination syllabus in history restricts the history teachers in using these methods (debates, projects and dramatization). This is because in an attempt to cover the school certificate history -syllabus, history teachers in the top classes of these schools may not find it profitable to ask their pupils to work in groups very often.

In another research conducted by Adeyinka (1990) in Nigeria on the objectives and methods of teaching history, the findings showed that the lecture method was the most frequently used for history teaching in the senior secondary schools of Kwara State. With a sample size of 108, the lecture method had a mean score of 4.92 out of a maximum possible score of 5, with as many as 99 (91.7%) of the respondents indicating that they used the method always, and 9 (8.3%) indicating that they use it often. The question and answer method had a mean score as high as 3.78 which also meant that the method was frequently used just like the discussion method which had a mean score of 3.58. The study indicated that the methods were frequently used by senior secondary school history teachers in Kwara State. Students' preference for teaching methods supports the use of traditional methods of teaching. A study by Qualters (2001) suggests that students do not favour active teaching methods because of the in-class time taken by the activities, fear of not

covering all of the material in the course, and anxiety about changing from traditional classroom expectations to the active structure.

In a study conducted by Ragland (2007) involving twenty (20) history teachers in America, the results showed that in terms of the instructional practices, what the teachers did in the classroom were not research-supported practices for increasing student engagement in history. More specifically, all the respondents indicated that they used class discussion most often. Another practice used by the majority of teachers was lectures (70%). The rest include resource person narrative (5%) and historical fiction (5%): Non of the respondents indicated using field trips.

In a related study by Germanou (2007) in Cyprus, it was revealed that the lecture and discussion methods of teaching were the most frequent used methods for teaching history in Cyprus secondary education. The study which involved 185 respondents had mean scores of 3.85 and 3.84 for the lecture and discussion methods respectively.

From the above discussion, it is clear that instructors patronized the discussion, question and answer as well as the lecture methods of teaching in the various study areas. However, it is important that a variety of teaching techniques be used in the teaching of history as a means of addressing individual needs, thereby making the learning process adjunct to the teaching and learning of history (Education Commission on Education in Morals and Ethics, 1994).

## Teaching and Learning Resources

In a separate study conducted by Levin and Lockheed (1991); Wang, Haertel, and Walberg (1993) concerning the correlation between sufficient instructional resources for history teaching and the achievement of learners, they all concluded that sufficient teaching resources for history lessons correlates with high achievement. This finding is consistent with the findings of Heyneman, Farrel and Sepulveda-Stuardo (1978) in earlier studies on instructional resources for teaching history. In that study, Heyneman et al. (1978) found that availability of resources is the most consistent factor in predicting academic achievement. This implies that the availability of instructional resources for history teaching is important.

While the above findings support the need for schools to acquire instructional resources for history lessons, a study conducted by Oakes and Saunders (2002) in California to find out the availability and adequacy of instructional materials for teaching history revealed the following:

1. many history students did not have access to the numbers and quality of instructional materials, and technology that should be fundamental to all students;
2. at many schools, shortages and poor quality of instructional resources for history existed in concert with other problematic school conditions that diminish students' opportunities to learn; and
3. actions by governments had either contributed to or failed to prevent students' lack of access to instructional resources.

Oakes and Saunders (2002) further support their findings with the ones conducted by Harris (2002) and Rand (2002) which also concluded that

teachers do not have access to instructional materials needed to provide students with the educational opportunities required to meet academic standards.

A study by Lee and Doolittle (2006) also indicated that 70% of history students nationwide who took the 8<sup>th</sup> grade National U. S history test and 77% of those who took 12<sup>th</sup> grade test reported they used instructional resources twice a month or less. This clearly shows the rare use of instructional resources because of their unavailability. However, authentic historical inquiry is suggested by some researchers to be particularly affected by the use of instructional resources (Doolittle & Hicks, 2003).

Another study conducted by Baker and Moroz (1997) also concluded that social studies and history teachers tend to repeatedly use textbooks more than other resources.

In a similar study conducted by Lee and Doolittle (2006) on history and social studies teachers' use of instructional resources, it was revealed that social studies and history teachers used historical texts such as textbooks and others more than the other instructional resources such as the audio and audio-visual resources.

Again, a large range of studies show that history textbooks are extensively used in schools (Educational Product Information Exchange Institute 'EPIE', 1977). In the study of the Institute (E.P.I.E), it was reported that history textbooks were the basis for 67% of classroom instruction, while an additional 22% of classroom instruction revolved around other materials. The Institute concluded that 89% of instructional time was structured around textbooks (E.P.I.E, 1977).

In another study, 92% of nearly 1,100 randomly selected California school teachers reported that they used textbooks more than any other material as part of their instruction (California Department of Education CDE, 2003). The findings suggest that history teachers depend so much on the history textbooks to the detriment of the other resources for instruction. Such a situation is not likely to enhance the teaching and learning of history which by its nature is abstract and will, therefore, need the use of other resources like visual and audio-visual materials.

On visual resources, Harris (2002), in his research “Survey of California Teachers” discovered that of the 786 teachers in the survey, a large number of the teachers indicated that they did not have enough maps, charts, atlases, pictures and reference materials to use in class. This means that those that were available were not adequate for teachers and students.

Clearly, it can be concluded that history teachers very much often used history textbooks than the other instructional resources. It can be that the non-availability of such resources compels teachers to rely so much on the textbooks.

### **Assessment Instruments**

A lot of studies show the use of alternative, performance and authentic assessment over the traditional assessment instruments in assessing students’ learning outcomes in history. In a study, Hancock (1994) revealed that history teachers use alternative and authentic assessments in assessing students because such assessment instruments instill in history students life-long skills related to critical thinking that builds a basis for further learning.



In another study, Drake (1997) confirms history teachers use of alternative assessment such as project work and group presentation. The reason being that alternative assessment helps to improve the teaching and learning of history. He stated that using traditional assessment in assessing students' learning outcomes in history will encourage recall of discrete information and emphasizes low-level cognition.

Nickell (1993) also revealed in another study that an alternative assessment method is used by teachers in measuring students' achievements in social studies. Nickell argued that the goal of social studies is to promote civic competence which cannot be effectively assessed using the traditional assessment methods. The hypothesis is that history which is social studies oriented will also make use of such methods of assessment to measure its higher order level cognition.

Grant and Gradwell (2008) sum up their study on the use of assessment instruments in the teaching and learning of history in Canada as follows; out of a total number of 17 history teachers, the majority of them indicated they use higher-order thinking over lower-level thinking tasks, non-traditional over traditional forms of assessment instruments and "doing" history over "knowing" history tasks in the teaching of history. This clearly shows that teachers use alternative assessment methods in assessing history students' understandings.

### **Learning Styles**

Using sample size of 56 high school students in America, Adkins and Brown-Syed (2002) conducted a study on students' learning styles on all

subjects. They concluded that students who used verbal and visual learning styles had a mean score of 9.3 and active and reflective learning styles also had a mean of 11.0. The researchers concluded that students were fairly well balanced in their learning styles.

Another research conducted in America by Felder, Lee, Litzinger and Wise (2007) on high school students' learning styles concurs with the finding of Adkins and Brown-Syed (2002). They concluded that the pattern of usage for verbal-visual and active-reflective learning styles by students was similar. Thus, preference for use of these learning styles was in equal proportion. Although these research findings were not related to history students per se but to the learning styles of students in general. Hence it can be assumed that students of history also learn in a similar way.

### **Teachers' Perceptions**

Achieving the goals of teaching, is dependent on many factors which mainly come from teachers (Costa, 1998). What teachers say and do in classrooms greatly affect student learning. Many researchers have demonstrated that certain teachers' behaviours influence students' achievement, self-concept, social relationship, and thinking abilities (Dunn, 1998; Smith, 2002). They indicate that teachers play an important role in educating people. Therefore, if teachers have a positive perception of teaching, then they can at least conduct the teaching effectively to the ends of education. It has been established that students understanding of the connections between historical topics studied and contemporary issues tend to be very weak

because of history teachers' perception which have influenced the way they teach the subject (Ofstead, 2005).

However, in a study conducted by Wolley and Wrang (2007) concerning the perception of history teachers, the results indicated that 94% of the teachers involved in the study have a positive perception of the teaching of history, particularly the teaching of controversial topics.

In a related study in Religious and Moral Education conducted by Holden (2002) on the perception of teachers about moral education in Alabama, it was revealed that the teaching of moral education is highly favoured by the majority of the teachers.

In a survey by Farlow (2002) on teachers' perceptions about the moral education programme in three states in the United States of America, the survey results indicated that the majority of the respondents considered moral education as part of the solution to the perceived moral decline in the United States of America.

Sugerman (2004) also investigated the perception of secondary school teachers concerning Religious Education in Denmark and concluded that secondary school teachers have a substantial concern for the teaching of religious education.

The study of Bever (2004) on "Assessment of Teachers' perception of and attitude to Moral Education" also revealed that teachers have a positive perception that moral education is a tool for instilling moral values in the young. Here, the idea is that RME and History which are all Arts subjects and further deal with inculcation of moral values will have similar characteristics;

therefore it is assumed that teachers of both subjects have the same perceptions of their subjects.

An Australian study of teachers and students perceptions of social studies and other school subjects (Moroz, 1995) has provided an insight into how teachers perceive the teaching of social studies which also has similar orientations like history. The findings indicated that teachers have a positive perception of the teaching of social studies.

The results of all the above studies concur with the study of Wolley and Wrang (2007) on the perception of history teachers. It is therefore hypothesized that history teachers have a positive perception of the teaching of the subject history.

### **Students' Perceptions**

History is designed to equip students with the analytical skills and factual knowledge necessary to deal critically with problems. However, the issue of developing analytical and critical thinking skills in students is no more the case for teaching history, because students now see history as a subject whose understanding is gained through the recall of facts rather than analyzing and critically sifting out information to really understand historical happenings. Holt's (1990) affirms this through a conversation he had with history students who indicated that they viewed history as a story which needed to be memorized to pass an examination. In other words, history is a story with a predetermined plot to be memorized but not interpreted. Shemilt (2000) concurs and notes that constructivist research into students' historical

thinking suggests that students perceive the learning of history to be the presentation of a uniform picture of the past.

The study of Ragland (2007) in America confirms this; when he concluded in his study that history students tend to see history as a series of dates, names, and places lacking meaning or relevance to be learnt through memorization.

Germanou (2007) also investigated students' perception of learning history in Cyprus secondary education. The survey results revealed that students involved in the study have a negative perception of the learning of history because they consider history as a difficult subject to learn.

Harris and Haydn (2006) in their study, "Pupil perceptions of history as a school subject" in Switzerland, submitted that students had a negative perception of the subject history simply because they were not able to give reasons for studying history which reflected the aims and purposes of the subject as indicated in recent curriculum specifications.

A lot of studies conducted in social studies which encompasses historical topics also indicate that students have a negative perception of the learning of the subject. An Australian study of teachers and students perceptions of social studies and other school subjects has provided an insight into this partnership problem (Moroz, Baker, & McDonald, 1995). The study focused largely on the status of social studies as perceived by students and teachers, and revealed a wide disparity between the perceptions of both groups. In reporting on how they think, it was found out that students have a negative perception of the subject because they rated the subject very low. The low status of social studies accorded by students has been known for a number

of decades in the United States, where there has been widespread status studies conducted for over 50 years. The majority of studies over this period report that students not only accord low status to social studies, such as reported in the Australian study (Moroz, Baker & McDonald, 1995), but generally have negative perception of the subject.

The literature repeatedly presents findings showing social studies to be among the least-liked subjects by students. The research teams of Shaver, Davis and Helburn (1979); Schug, Todd and Beery (1984) concluded that a majority of students found social studies to be uninteresting, unimportant and insignificant. Shaughnessy and Haladyna (1985) also reported that most students surveyed indicated that social studies was a boring subject. The problem for social studies in schools in the United States according to Shaughnessy and Haladyna (1985) is that "social studies" is the least stimulating and the least liked subject".

As the literature above reveals, students consistently report they do not like social studies because they do not consider it to be important, and place little value on it. Student learning outcomes in such a subject will be adversely affected if the learners have negative perception of the subject. The findings concur with the study conducted by Ragland (2007) in history. It is therefore hypothesized that history students will also have a negative perception of the history subject since both subjects have similar characteristics. What is implied here is that history students have a negative perception of the history subject.

### Summary of Literature Review

The review of literature was done to provide the researcher with guidance to arrive at a theoretical and empirical framework for the study. Theoretical review of literature looked at the concept of curriculum evaluation, types of evaluation. The chapter also reviewed sub-topics such as the senior high school history syllabus, learning styles and perception.

The empirical review focused on global studies to establish current trends in the teaching and learning of history. The literature revealed that history teachers patronized the discussion, lecture as well as the question and answer methods of teaching.

With respect to the learning resources used for the teaching and learning history, the literature revealed that resources for the teaching and learning of history were inadequate and those available were also in poor state.

The literature review also established that history teachers use alternative and performance assessment procedures which include such techniques like project work, oral presentation, and investigative study among others.

In the case of learning styles, the empirical review brought to light that students prefer the use of both visual-verbal and active-reflective learning styles. It was clearly seen that students were fairly well balanced in their learning styles.

The literature finally brought to the fore the perception of history teachers of the teaching of history. All the studies reviewed indicated that teachers have a positive perception of the teaching of history. Students' perception of the learning of history was also found to be negative.

The empirical review concentrated on other areas in the world which have different characteristics and cultural background when juxtaposed with Ghana. In this respect the study is therefore necessary to unearth what prevails in Ghana so as to help improve the teaching and learning of history.



## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter describes the steps that were followed to gather data for the study. Specifically, it covers the research design, population, sample and sampling techniques, research instruments, data collection procedure and method of data analysis.

#### **Research Design**

In this study, the descriptive survey was used to gather the necessary information. The descriptive survey allows the collection of data in order to test hypotheses or answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of study. Gay (1992) attests to this when he says that descriptive survey determines and reports the way things are, which in this case is the teaching and learning of history. Gay (1992) further notes that the descriptive design rightly befits investigations concerning educational problems including evaluation or assessment of attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions and procedures. Therefore, the descriptive survey was deemed an appropriate design for an evaluative study of the teaching and learning of history in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana.

According to Fink (2001), the design also enables the researcher to describe, observe and document aspects of a situation as it naturally occurs rather than explaining it. It enables the researcher to produce a good amount of responses from a wide range of people. Several writers (Sarantakos, 1998; Creswell, 2002) point out that data gathered with such a design provides a more accurate picture of events and seeks to explain people's perception and behaviour on the basis of data gathered at a point in time.

Despite the advantages of the descriptive survey, it could also delve into private matters, making some respondents unwilling to disclose the right information. Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) point out that getting a significant number of questionnaires completed and returned so that meaningful analysis could be made is another difficulty with the use of the descriptive survey design.

However, the following steps were taken to correct the weaknesses associated with the descriptive survey. The questionnaires were pilot-tested, which enabled the researcher to revise ambiguous statements for clarity. Respondents were also assured that their responses would be treated as confidential and would be used for academic purpose. Finally, the questionnaires were administered to respondents and retrieved on the same day. This helped to obtain a high return rate.

### **Population**

At the time of the study, Central Region had fifty-five (55) Senior High Schools of which thirty-one (31) offer History. The list of schools offering History was obtained from the Regional Education Office, Cape

Coast. (See Appendix B). The target population for the study comprised teachers and students of History in all the Senior High Schools that offer History in the Region. However, the accessible population consisted of History teachers and form two History students in all the 31 Senior High Schools that offer History. Form two students were used for the study because of the structure of the education system under the 2007 reform. Form one students are not allowed to study any of their elective subjects and form three students were not using the new syllabus.

### **Sample and Sampling Technique**

The sample size for the study consisted of 600 respondents, comprising 30 teachers and 570 students from the Senior High Schools that offer history. Because the number of schools that offer history in the Region was small, the study made use of all the schools.

A multi-stage sampling technique was used. Both proportional simple random sampling and census methods were used. The proportional simple random sampling technique was used to select 20% of form two students in each school. This yielded a student sample of 570 out of 2,856 for the study. The proportion of 20% used was in line with guidelines provided by Fink (2001) who suggested that “if the population is a few hundreds, a 20% sample will do” (p.14). The census method was used to select all the history teachers in the schools because of their small number.

## Research Instruments

To obtain data to answer the research questions, two main instruments were used. These were questionnaire and observation guide. In addition to these, documentary analysis was employed to seek documentary evidence .

### Questionnaire

There were two sets of questionnaire - one for students and the other for teachers. The questionnaire for students (Appendix C) had six sections and fifty-three (56) items as follows:

1. Section A (items 1-4) – demographic data.
2. Section B (items 5-13) – teaching techniques teachers use for teaching history.
3. Section D (items 14-23) – availability of teaching and learning resources.
4. Section F (items 24-31) – assessment instruments used by teachers.
5. Section C (items 32-43) – students learning styles
6. Section E (items 44-54) – students’ perceptions of the learning of history.

The questionnaire for teachers (Appendix D) had five sections and fifty-one (52) items as follows:

1. Section A (items 1-6) – demographic data.
2. Section B (items 7-15) – techniques teachers use for teaching history.
3. Section C (items 16-27) – availability of teaching and learning resources.
4. Section E (items 28-35) – assessment instruments used by teachers.

5. Section D (items 36-50) – teachers’ perceptions of the teaching of history.

With the exception of items that dealt with demographic information and teaching periods, all the other items were designed on a Likert-type scale. For instance, items on the questionnaire elicited responses which range from “Never” (N) to “Regularly” (R).

### **Observation Guide**

The main objective for the use of the observation guide (Appendix E) was to assess the teaching-learning interaction. Specifically, it was to find out the use of teaching-learning resources (textbooks, charts and maps) and the use of teaching techniques (discussion, lecture as well as the question and answer methods) during the teaching of history. Generally, the observation guide was used to confirm, cross-validate or corroborate the responses that were supplied in the questionnaires.

### **Documentary Evidence**

Documentary evidence was gathered from the history syllabus and available books. This data helped the researcher to identify any gaps in what the curriculum prescribed and what actually happens in the classroom.

### **Validity and Reliability of Instrument**

The researcher’s supervisors helped to determine the content validity of the instruments. The questionnaire and observation guide were presented to them for their comments and suggestions. The suggestions they made were

used to revise the initial items. The questionnaire was then pre-tested in three Senior High Schools in the Greater Accra Region, which had similar characteristics as the schools selected for the study. These were Accra Academy, St. Mary Senior High School and Accra Girls Senior High. Sarantakos (1998) reveals that pre-tests are “small tests of single elements of the research instruments, which are predominantly used to check eventual mechanical problems of these instruments” (p. 292). The main purpose of the pre-test was to validate the appropriateness of the items. The items were tested on 30 students and 6 teachers. The Cronbach’s alpha was also used to measure the internal consistency and to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. Since the majority of the items in the questionnaires were multiple-scored, the Cronbach alpha was deemed suitable. A reliability co-efficient of .735 was achieved after pre-test, meaning that the instrument was reliable because Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) assert that “For research purposes, a useful rule of thumb is that reliability should be at .70 and preferably higher” (p.179). Notwithstanding this, few items which were found to be misleading were modified to facilitate easy reading and understanding.

The pre-test was conducted in November 2008 and collection of the main data for the study took place in December 2008.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

#### **Questionnaire Administration**

Before data collection took off, the researcher presented a letter of introduction from the Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education to the heads of the schools selected for the study, to seek permission for the conduct

of the research. A meeting was then held with the History teachers and students separately to explain the purpose of the study and the questionnaire to them. The reason for the approach was to make sure that fitting responses were elicited from the respondents. The respondents were assured of confidentiality in order to inspire them to respond to the items without any suspicion. Questionnaires were then administered to the History teachers and students separately. They were allowed ample time to complete the questionnaires, after which they were collected the same day. Return rate of the questionnaires for teachers and students was 97% and 100% respectively.

### **Lesson Observation**

Data were also gathered by observing history lessons. This was done for the purpose of cross-checking views expressed on the questionnaire. It was to find out the situation on the ground with respect to the teaching and learning of history. From the 31 teachers used for the study, 10 (one per school) were selected for the observation exercise. Each teacher was observed twice in a double period lesson of eighty (80) minutes each. The teachers were rated on a four-point scale indicating the extent to which they demonstrated the competencies outlined in the observation guide. All observations were done by the researcher alone.

### **Data Analysis**

First, the questionnaires were serially numbered for easy identification. The data collected were edited, not necessarily altering responses to suit the researcher but to ensure that responses were suitable. The editing also helped

to eliminate responses on the questionnaires which were found to be invalid. Finally, the questionnaires were coded for easy analysis. For the coding, the items were assigned numerical values of 1, 2, 3, and 4 for each of the following:

- i. “Never” (1); “Rarely” (2); “Occasionally” (3) and “Regularly” (4)
- ii. “Not at all” (1); “Some How” (2) “Much” (3) and “Very Much” (4)
- iii. “Not Available At All” (1); “Available But Not Adequate” (2) and “Available And Adequate” (3)
- iv. “Not Used” (1); “Occasionally Used” (2) ; “Often Used” (3) and “Very Often Used” (4).
- v. “Strongly Disagree” (1); “Disagree” (2); “Agree” (3) and “Strongly Agree” (4).

All responses for each item in the questionnaire were analysed with Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 12.0) for windows. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages and means were used to summarise and to determine the direction of responses. Narrative notes were used to analyse patterns in the observation made.

Data that were gathered from documents were also analysed by summarizing and comparing themes.

Finally, the data from the documentary analysis, the observation guide and the questionnaire were matched up to provide well-validated and substantiated findings to answer the research questions.



## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents and discusses findings of the research. The main purpose of the study was to evaluate the teaching and learning of history in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana.

In analyzing and interpreting the responses, the researcher made use of frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations to generate answers to the six research questions raised in the study. The issues raised by the research questions are:

1. Teaching techniques used by teachers.
2. Learning styles employed by students.
3. Resources used for teaching and learning history.
4. Assessment procedures used by history teachers.
5. Perception of teachers of the teaching of history.
6. Perception of students of the learning of history.

Before turning to the main findings, it is important to present the demographic characteristics of the teachers and students who took part in the study.

### Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

As noted in chapter three, thirty (30) teachers and five hundred and seventy (570) students took part in this study. Their personal characteristics are presented in Tables 1 to 7.

Table 1

#### Gender of Teachers

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	24	80.0
Female	6	20.0
Total	30	100.0

Table 1 clearly shows that there is unequal spread among the history teachers, with males being the majority. The relatively large number of male teachers in the sample tends to support the general assumption that males are more into history than females.

Table 2

**Age distributions of teachers**

Age	Frequency	Percentage
21 – 30 years	4	13.3
31 – 40 years	16	53.4
41 – 50 years	10	33.3
Total	30	100.0

Table 2 also shows that 20(66.7%) of the teachers (20) were 40 years or below, meaning that they were relatively young. It might, therefore, be expected that such young teachers would bring much energy and commitment to the teaching and learning of their subject, thereby provoking students' interest in it.

Table 3

**Highest Academic Qualification of Teachers**

Academic Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
GCE 'A' Level	2	6.7
Diploma	2	6.7
Bachelor's Degree	22	73.3
Master's Degree	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0

In this study, teachers' academic qualification is defined as non-teaching educational qualification. In Table 3, the data indicate that

academically most of the teachers 22(73.3%), had a bachelor's degree, while 4 (13.3%) of them had a master's degree. Only 2 (6.7%) were Diploma holders and another 2 (6.7%) had GCE 'A' Level Certificate. Thus, by Ghana Education Service policy, almost all the teachers had the minimum educational qualification (a bachelor's degree) for teaching in Senior High Schools. The academic qualifications of the teachers also suggest that they would possess good mastery of the subject matter of history. However, the instance of Diploma and GCE 'A' level holders teaching an academically demanding subject like history, is worrisome.

Table 4

**Highest Professional Qualification of Teachers**

Professional Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
Certificate in Education	2	6.7
Post Graduate Diploma in Education	4	13.3
Bachelor in Education	20	66.7
Master's in Education	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0

Table 4 reveals that, professionally, all the teachers were qualified to teach in Senior High Schools. One would, therefore, expect that such professional qualifications would translate into the teachers' use of appropriate methods and resources to teach history. Whether this was the case will be seen when the main data are presented.

Table 5

**Number of Years of Teaching History**

No. of Years of Teaching	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 1 year	2	6.7
1 – 5 years	14	46.6
6 – 10 years	6	20.0
11 – 15 years	6	20.0
16 – 20 years	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

From Table 5, it can be established that over a half (53.3%) of the teachers had taught for less than 6 years. The literature on teachers' career stages often describes teachers who have taught for 5 years or less as beginning or inexperienced teachers (Fessler & Christansen, 1992; Steffy, 1989). Applying this criterion, it could be said that a good number of the teachers were not experienced. Their lack of experience could adversely affect the teaching of their subject (history).

Table 6

**Gender of Students**

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	308	54.0
Female	262	46.0
Total	570	100.0

A look at the data in Table 6 shows that there is almost an equal gender spread among the students. This almost equal representation of male and female students was rather accidental but not intentional.

Table 7

**Age Distribution of Students**

Age	Frequency	Percentage
10 – 15 years	54	9.5
16 – 20 years	504	88.4
21 – 25 years	8	1.4
26 and above	4	0.7
Total	570	100.0

The data in Table 9 indicate that majority 504(88.4%) of the students were between 16 and 20 years. This is significant for the learning of history because, according to Sigmund Freud's Psychoanalytic theory, people within this age range are able to think in abstract terms, which indeed is in consonance with the abstract nature of the subject history.

**Teaching Techniques Used by Teachers**

The following teaching techniques have been recommended in the syllabus to be used for the teaching of history: discussion, question and answer, lecture, project method, brainstorming, field trip and debates. The study sought to find out if teachers used these techniques in the classroom.

Hence, research question one was posed thus: What teaching techniques do history teachers use during history lessons?

To answer this question, items 7-15 on the teachers' questionnaire and 5-13 on the students' questionnaire asked respondents to indicate how often specific teaching techniques were used in the history classroom. Their responses are presented in Table 8. Apart from the questionnaire data, data on teachers' actual use of the teaching techniques were gathered from observing lessons taught by ten (10) teachers. Each teacher was observed two (2) times, giving a total of twenty (20) lessons.

Table 8

**Teachers' and Students' opinion on the frequency of use of teaching techniques**

Teaching Technique		Never (F )%	Rarely(F) %	Occasionally( F)%	Regularly(F) %	Mean	Std. Dev.
Discussion	T	-	(2)6.7	(4)13.3	(24)80.0	3.73	.59
	S	(10)1.8	(32)5.6	(68)11.9	(460)80.7	3.72	.65
Field work	T	(12) 40.0	(10)33.3	(8)26.7	-	1.87	.83
	S	(422)74.0	(44)7.7	(74)13.0	(30)5.3	1.50	.91
Dramatization/Role Play	T	(8)26.7	(6)20.0	(14)46.7	(2)6.7	2.33	.93
	S	(400)70.2	(54)9.5	(70)12.3	(46)8.1	1.58	.99
Question and Answers	T	(2)6.7	-	(2)6.7	(26)86.7	3.73	.98
	S	(20)3.5	(30)5.3	(92)16.1	(428)75.1	3.63	.74



Table 8 continued

Teaching Technique		Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Occasionally (y)	Regularly (%)	Mean	Std. Dev.
Lecture	T	(2)6.7	(8)26.7	(4)13.3	(16)53.3	3.13	.80
	S	(162)28.4	(40)7.0	(100)17.5	(268)47.0	2.83	1.29
Discovery/Inquiry	T	(10)33.3	(6)20.0	(12)40.0	(2) 6.7	2.20	1.01
	S	(222)38.9	(84)14.7	(158)27.7	(106)18.6	2.26	1.16
Activity	T	(4)13.3	(2)6.7	(12)40.0	(12)40.0	3.07	1.03
	S	(260)45.6	(106)18.6	(122)21.4	(82)14.4	2.05	1.12
Debate	T	(10)33.3	(2)6.7	(10)33.3	(8)26.7	2.53	1.24
	S	(374)65.6	(62)10.9	(80)14.0	(54)9.5	1.67	1.03
Brainstorming	T	(2)6.7	(6)20.0	(8)26.7	(14)46.7	3.13	.99
	S	(146)25.6	(124)21.8	(144)25.3	(156)27.4	2.54	1.15

T = Teachers      S = Students

Mean ranges: Never (0.00 – 1.50); Rarely (1.60 – 2.50); Occasionally (2.60 – 3.50); and Regularly (3.60 – 4.00).

Table 8 depicts that the question and answer and discussion methods of teaching were the most frequently used methods. Responses indicate that both methods were used regularly. Teachers' responses recorded high mean scores of 3.73 and 3.73 for the discussion and question and answer methods respectively. On the part of students, these methods had means of 3.72 and 3.63 respectively. This was followed by the lecture method which had mean values of 3.13 and 2.83 for teachers and students respectively. The figures portray that the other teaching techniques are not often used by teachers in the history classroom.

Items 6-30 on the observation guide (See Appendix E) were used by the researcher to examine the actual and appropriate use of the methods indicated by teachers and students as the most frequently used methods in teaching history (discussion, lecture as well as the question and answer method).

The observation established that history teachers indeed used discussion, question and answer as well as the lecture method though not as regularly as the questionnaire responses indicated. Also, teachers did not demonstrate that they could use those methods competently. For instance, teachers used whole class discussion method to the neglect of small group discussion. Secondly, teachers did not allow time for students to discuss through sharing and analysis of questions.

With respect to the question and answer method, it was observed that questions that were asked by teachers demanded mere recall. What is implied is that the teachers did not ask high order thinking questions. Again, how teachers asked questions and handled students responses were not the best. These

observations show that teachers lacked some skills in the use of questions as a teaching technique.

The lecture method which dominated all lessons observed made most of the history lessons dull and dry. This is simply because teachers did not provide aids to illustrate their points. There were also no questions to check students' understanding. Finally, the principle of logical presentation of lessons was lacking.

The findings indicate that most of the recommended methods were not used in the teaching of history. The syllabus recommends that methods such as question and answer, discussion, lecture, project method, brainstorming, field trips and debate are to be used in the teaching of history. Questionnaire data revealed that the discussion, question and answer as well as the lecture method were the most frequently used methods. With respect to how well teachers used these methods, the observation data revealed that they were not used appropriately by teachers. For example, teachers asked questions that demanded simple recall; teachers did not allow students to share and analyze issues themselves; teachers did not present lessons in logical and sequential manner.

These findings imply that most of the recommended methods were not used by history teachers, and those used were not appropriately used. Perhaps, students' disliked for active teaching methods because of the in-class time taken by the activities, fear of not covering all of the material in the course, and anxiety about changing from traditional classroom expectations to the active structure, explain why teachers do not use most of the recommended methods in the history classroom (Qualters, 2001). The results, therefore, confirm earlier findings (Adejumobi, 1978; Germanon, 2007; Ragland, 2007) that history teachers frequently use the discussion, question and answer, and lecture methods in teaching.

Again, the findings suggest that the discussion method was the most frequently used method by history teachers. This might be that the discussion method helps promote learners' interest in the subject and further reduces students' passivity. This concurs with Myers' (1986) position that the discussion method is used more frequently because it helps to engage learners' interest, challenge their present thinking process and create the atmosphere where active reflection and interchange replace caution and passivity. It may also be that, the method compels learners to be knowledge seekers. And as Kam-Fai (1973) asserts, the discussion method promotes interest by giving the learner a share in the responsibility for the course and in search for knowledge. These might explain its patronage by history teachers.

The fact that the question and answer method had mean scores of 3.73 and 3.63 in teachers' and students' view respectively, means that this method is gaining ground in the history classroom, like the discussion method. It might also be that because of the investigative nature of history, teachers tend to use this method so as to develop in students the attitude to inquire, which in the view of Anti and Anum (2003) give students the opportunity to inquire and research on a topic.

The result also shows the lecture method as the third most patronised method. This means that the lecture method is still frequently used for history teaching in the Senior High Schools. This confirms the research findings of Adeyinka (1990) that the lecture method was still used for history teaching in the Senior Secondary Schools of Kwara State in Nigeria. The use of the lecture method seems laudable because, according to Kam-Fai (1973), the lecture method gives information that is not readily available to students. It can also be argued that the method helps novice learners in the beginning of the course. Kimble and Makaechie (1960) attest that the method meets the dependency needs of learners

who are especially dependent at the beginning of a course. The findings further revealed brainstorming as a major technique used in the teaching of history. This may also be that teachers consider critical thinking skill, which is the most important aim of the subject, as best taught by the use of brainstorming. According to Cullen (1998), brainstorming helps students to generate new ideas and promote creative thinking.

Finally, the findings showed the unpopularity of such methods as debate, role play, discovery and field trip. This is not encouraging because of the vast advantages associated with these methods in teaching a subject like history. For instance, field trips and discovery methods of teaching develop in history learners acts of creativity and critical thinking, since they discover many things which cannot be accomplished in the normal classroom work (Tamakloe et al, 2005). It is, therefore, unfortunate that such methods are not used by history teachers. The reason for their non-patronage, especially field trip, may be the non-availability of funds. It is not unusual for history teachers to reject the field trip method and other methods requiring heavy financial provision. However, in the candid opinion of the researcher, the absence of funds from Government should not militate against the use of field trip as a method of teaching.

Though respondents indicated the frequent use of the discussion, question and answer, and lecture methods, it was found in the classroom observations that these techniques could be better described as teacher-centred recitation or lecture on factual details, rather than discussion or question and answer.

### **Availability and Use of Instructional Resources**

The study further sought to find out the teaching and learning resources available for history lessons. This was the focus of Research Question 2, which asked: What teaching and learning resources are available for history lessons? To answer this question, items 16 – 21 and 14 – 19 on the teachers' and students' questionnaire respectively, asked respondents to indicate the availability and adequacy of instructional resources. Then items 22 – 27 and 20 – 23 on the teachers and students' questionnaire respectively, asked respondents to indicate how specific instructional resources were being used. The results are presented in two sections. The first looks at the availability of instructional resources in the schools and the second considers the degree of use.

Apart from the questionnaire data, information on the actual use of the instructional resource was gathered from observing lessons taught by teachers.

The recommended instructional resources in the syllabus for the effective teaching of each topic include textbooks, visual aids such as maps, charts and pictures, historical diary, newspapers, audio-visual aids such as film and the use of museums as well as resource persons. Table 9 presents teachers' views on the availability and adequacy of resources

Table 9

**Teachers' View on the Availability and Adequacy of Resources**

Resources	Not Available at all (F)%	Available But not Adequate (F)%	Available and Adequate (F)%	Mean	Std Dev
History syllabus	(4)13.3	(6)20.0	(20)66.7	2.53	.74
History textbooks	-	(20)66.7	(10)33.3	2.33	.49
Teachers' guide	(22)73.3	(4)13.3	(4)13.3	1.40	.74
Audio material	(26)86.7	-	(4)13.3	1.27	.70
Visual materials	(8)26.7	(18)60.0	(4)13.3	1.87	.64
Audio-visual materials	(28)93.3	-	(2)6.7	1.13	.52

Mean ranges: Not available (0.00 – 1.50); available but not adequate (1.60 – 2.50) and Available and adequate (2.60 – 3.50).

Means of Means =1.76

Means of standard deviation = 0.64.

The responses of teachers indicate that with the exception of history syllabus and textbooks which obtain mean values of 2.53 and 2.33 respectively, all the other resources have low mean values ranging between 1.13 and 1.87. This clearly indicates that instructional resources were either not available at all or they were available but inadequate. This is confirmed by the mean of means of 1.76. Table 10 displays students' views on the availability and adequacy of resources.

Table 10

**Students' Views on the Availability and Adequacy of Resources**

Resources	Not Available (F)%	Not Adequate (F)%	Adequate (F)%	Mean	Std Dev
History textbooks	(92)16.1	(278)48.8	(190)33.3	2.21	.72
Audio materials	(504)88.4	(46)8.1	(2).4	1.15	.46
Visual materials	(326)57.2	(180)31.6	(64)11.2	1.15	.69
Audio-visual materials	(446)78.2	(94)16.5	(30)5.3	1.27	.55

Mean ranges: Not available at all (0.00 – 1.50); available but not adequate (1.60 – 2.50); and available and adequate (2.60 – 3.50).

Mean of Means = 1.45

Mean of standard deviation = 0.61.

Data on students' responses from Table 10 indicate that with the exception of history textbooks, which obtained a mean value of 2.21, the other instructional resources have low means between 1.27 and 1.15, meaning that instructional resources for the teaching of history were not available. The mean of means of 1.45 also confirms this.

Generally, teachers' responses show that the resources are "available but inadequate" and students' responses indicate "not available at all". The difference in responses could be that students are ignorant of the appropriate instructional resources for teaching the subject.

Through observation, it was found out that the recommended instructional resources for the teaching and learning of the subject were virtually unavailable in the schools. The only instructional resources which were available included



syllabus, textbooks and maps but these were also inadequate. These materials were also found to be in poor state. Among the ten schools observed, none of them had instructional resources such as audio materials and audio-visual materials.

It can be concluded from the questionnaire and observation data that instructional resources needed for the teaching and learning of history are woefully not available in schools. First, this situation can be alluded to the inadequate finance which make the supply of instructional resources very problematic. Again, the non-availability of instructional resources can be attributed to the high intake of students in recent times which make sufficient supply of high quality textbooks, curriculum materials, and other resources critical. Whatever the reasons, the absence of these resources makes it unlikely that students will have access to the knowledge and skills they must master at each level of high school. Students might also not have adequate opportunities to learn. Yet, access to textbooks and other instructional materials are linked to academic achievement: they are required for teaching and learning, they are necessary for students if they are to pass high stakes tests and to meet entrance requirements for colleges and universities. It is, therefore, unfortunate that these critical educational inputs are not available in the schools.

The findings confirm several studies (Harris, 2002; Oakes & Saunders, 2002; SPRA, 2002; Rand, 2002) on the availability and adequacy of instructional materials for teaching history. All these studies show that many history teachers do not have access to the number and quality of instructional materials needed to provide students with the educational opportunities required to meet academic standards. The poor quality of instructional resources revealed through the observation also concurs with the study results of Oakes and Saunders (2002) that in many schools, shortages and poor quality of instructional resources for history

exist in concert with other problematic school conditions that diminish students' opportunities to learn. Such findings do not support what scholars have said with regard to the need to have access to instructional resources. Jarolimick and Foster (1989) have argued that in any learning environment, there must be enough quantity of good quality resources suitable for diverse range of learning styles. Oakes and Saunders (2002) posited that given the importance of instructional resources, their availability and quality are urgent and required responses. This is because the availability of instructional resources results in the quality of learning activities, and increases students' performance (Bruce 1987; Levin & Lockheed, 1991; Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1993).

The findings further indicate the availability of history textbooks in the schools. In the opinion of Adeyinka (1990), textbooks are the most common aids for history teaching; they are the primary tools that teachers use to organise their lessons and make content knowledge and skills available to students. The findings also show the unavailability of audio materials such as radio, tape recorders among others. Such a situation prevents students from getting what was actually said by great figures in history during history lessons, which Farrant (1980) attests help to appeal to all the senses of the students.

It has also been established by the findings that visual materials such as maps, charts, atlases and pictures were not available in the schools. The absence of these materials is a serious setback in the teaching and learning of a subject like history because these are the basic instructional resources that can reduce the abstract nature of the subject, and further make the history classroom lively and interesting.

There is also the unavailability of audio-visual materials such as televisions and filmstrips. The non-availability of these resources in the schools is

unacceptable because these resources are considered most important in the teaching and learning of history since they help to make events that took place a long time look real to students and indeed reduce the abstract nature of teaching history. Tamakloe et al (2005) have contended that such resources are generally more suitable for class teaching than individual teaching.

The frequency of use of instructional resources in lesson delivery was also investigated. The results are presented Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11

**Teachers' Views on the Frequency of Use of Instructional Resources**

Resources	Not Used (F)%	Occasionally used (F)%	Often Used (F)%	Very Often Used (F)%	Mean	Std Dev.
History Syllabus	(2)6.7	-	(12)40	(16)53.3	3.40	.83
History textbooks	-	(2)6.7	(8)27	(20)66.7	3.60	.63
Teachers' Guide	(18)60	(8)26.7	(2)6.7	(2)6.7	1.60	.91
Audio material	(28)93	(2)6.7	-	-	1.07	.26
Visual materials	(10)33	(12)40	(4)13	(4)13	2.07	1.03
Audio-Visual materials	(26)87	(4)13	-	-	1.13	.35

Mean ranges: Not used (0.00 – 1.50); occasionally used (1.60 – 2.50) Often used (2.60 – 3 .50); and Very Often used (3.60 – 4.00)

Means of Means = 2.12

Means of standard deviation = 0.67

From Table 11, it is obvious that teachers only make use of the history textbooks and syllabus to the neglect of the other resources. This is indicated by mean values of 3.60 and 3.40 respectively. The other resources have low mean values of 2.07 and below, which shows that those instructional resources were either occasionally used or were not used at all. The pattern of the results as indicated by a mean of means of 2.12 is that generally resources were occasionally used as expressed by teachers.

Table 12

**Students’ Views on the Frequency of Use of Instructional Resources**

Resources	Not Used (F)%	Occasionally Used (F)%	Often Used (F)%	Very Often Used (F)%	Mean	Std. Dev.
History textbooks	(72)13	(135)23.5	(150)26	(214)38	2.89	1.05
Audio materials	(522)92	(30)5.3	(14)2.5	(4).7	1.12	.45
Visual materials	(366)64	(146)25.6	(40)7.0	(18)3.2	1.49	.76
Audio-visual materials	(516)91	(36)6.3	(4).7	(14)2.5	1.15	.53

Mean ranges: Not used (0.00 – 1.50); occasionally used (1.60 – 2.50) Often used (2.60 – 3.50); and Very Often used (3.60 – 4.00).

Mean of Means=1.66

Mean of standard deviation = 0.70

As shown by the data in Table 12, with the exception of the history textbooks, which has a mean of 2.89, all the other instructional resources have low means between 1.12 and 1.67. This indicates that the resources were either occasionally used or not used.

Responses in Tables 11 and 12 show that both teachers and students were of the view that generally instructional resources were occasionally used. This is indicated by the mean of means of 2.12 for teachers and 1.66 for teachers.

The observation guide was used to find out the appropriate use of history textbooks and visual materials such as maps and charts during history lessons. Items 31-37 on the observation guide were used by the researcher to examine the appropriate use of the instructional resources indicated by teachers and students as the most frequently used resources in teaching history.

The observation established that indeed, textbooks dominated history lessons. However, it was found that the textbook which occupied greater part of instructional time was usually read by teachers without an in-depth explanation but rather dictate notes for students to copy.

The questionnaire and the observation data showed that with the exception of the history textbooks, all the other instructional resources are not used by teachers and students during lesson delivery. Such a situation may be due to the non-availability of instructional resources in the schools. It can also be due to the inadequate time allocation allotted to history lessons. The findings confirm the study carried out by Lee and Doolittle (2006), which concluded that history

students nationwide in the United States used instructional resources twice or less a month, which imply the non use of instructional resources during history lessons.

The data also revealed that the history textbook is the most central instructional aid used in the teaching and learning of history in secondary schools. The use of the textbook can be explained by the fact that it is the only major resource available to teachers. Again, it seems that textbook is the most common aid teachers use to impart historical knowledge (Adeyinka, 1990). This view is endorsed by the studies carried out by Educational Product Information Exchange Institute (EPIEI), 1997; Cahen et al, 1983; California Department of Education (CDE, 2003), which concluded that the history textbooks were the basis for classroom instruction. This implies that history teachers depend much more on the history textbook than the other resources. Such a situation will not enhance the teaching and learning of history whose very nature is abstract and, therefore, needs the use of other resources like visual and audio-visual materials.

### **Assessment Instruments**

The following assessment instruments have been recommended in the syllabus to be used in assessing students' learning: projects which should take the form of practical work, experiments and investigative studies. The others include class test, class exercise, home work and term examination. The study sought to find out if teachers used these instruments to assess students' learning outcomes. Hence, research question four was posed thus: What instruments do history teachers employ to assess students' learning outcomes in the subject? To address this question, items 28 – 35 on the teachers' questionnaire and 24 – 31 on the students' questionnaire asked respondents to indicate how often specific assessment instruments used in the history classroom. Responses are presented in Table 13

Table 13

**Respondents' Views on How Often Assessment Instruments are Used in the Teaching of History.**

Assessment		Not used (F)%	Occasionally used (F)%	Often used (F)%	Very Often used (F)%	Mean	Std Dev.
Class test	T	-	(6)20.0	(10)33	(14)47	3.27	.80
	S	(24)4.2	(184)32.3	168)30	194)34	2.93	.91
Class exercise	T	-	(2)6.7	(12)40	(16)53	3.47	.64
	S	(72)13	(128)22.5	172)30	198)35	2.87	1.03
Home work	T	-	(12)40.0	(12)40	(6)20	2.80	.77
	S	(140)25	(176)30.9	144)25	110)19	2.39	1.06
Investigative study	T	(2)6.7	(16)53.3	(8)27	(4)13	2.47	.83
	S	(240)42	(164)28.8	(92)16	(74)13	2.00	1.05
Project work	T	(8)26.7	(10)33.3	(10)33	(4)13	2.20	.94
	S	(332)58	(134)23.5	(64)11	(40)7	1.67	.93
Group assignment	T	-	(22)73.3	(4)13	(4)13	2.40	.74
	S	(306)54	(142)24.9	(76)13	(46)8	1.76	.97
Oral questions	T	-	(2)6.7	(12)40	(16)53	3.47	.64
	S	(96)17	(98)17.2	148)26	228)40	2.86	1.11
Ind. Presentation	T	(4)13.3	(18)60.0	(4)13	(4)13	2.28	.88
	S	(204)36	(116)20.4	104)18	146)26	2.33	1.20

Mean ranges: Not used (0.00 – 1.50); Occasionally used (1.60 -2.50); Often used (2.60 – 3.50); and Very Often used (3.60 – 4.00).

Table 13 shows descriptive statistics of responses by teachers and students regarding the use of assessment instruments. According to the teachers, the assessment instruments that were often used were class exercise (with mean scores of 3.47) and class tests (with a mean score of 3.27). On the other hand, though the

same combination of instruments emerged dominant in students' responses, class test was rated by students as the most used assessment measure followed by class exercise.

The questionnaire data show that the assessment instruments required in assessing historical knowledge and understanding were not used. It is recommended in the history syllabus that assessment instruments such as project work, investigative study, experimental study, class test and class exercise are to be used in assessing students. However, the responses expressed by respondents on the questionnaire and the evidence gathered from students' books revealed that class exercises, class tests, terminal exams and sometimes home work were the assessment procedures often used to assess student knowledge. These are all traditional forms of assessment (Gronland, 2003). The data suggest that most of the assessment procedures were not used in the teaching and learning of the history subject.

In the first instance, the findings are contradictory with the assessment procedures which the history syllabus recommends to be used in assessing students' learning in history. It can be argued that teachers' anxiety to finish topics outlined in the syllabus makes them use less demanding assessment procedures such as class test, class exercise and among others. It also seems that teachers have the idea of helping students pass the external examinations and not the acquisition of 'real' historical knowledge, which is much achieved with the use of authentic and alternative assessment procedures such as oral presentation, project work, among others. Again, the high number of students in recent times may also explain why teachers patronize such assessment procedures in order to be able to mark students' work on time.



The findings therefore contradict what many researchers have established. For instance, Drake (1997) claimed in his study that history teachers used alternative assessment such as individual presentation, project work, documentary reports among others because it helped improve the teaching and learning of history since the use of only traditional assessments encourage recall of discrete information and emphasized low-level cognition. The findings further refute the research study by Hancock (1994) which revealed that history teachers use alternative and authentic assessments in assessing history students learning because such assessment approaches instill in history students life-long skills related to critical thinking that builds a basis for further learning.

From the discussion, it can be said that history teachers use of traditional form of assessments such as class test and class exercise to the neglect of the other forms of assessment does not improve the teaching and learning of the subject history and it does affects students' achievements, negatively. This supports Ari's (2007) study in which students indicated that they did not believe that daily assessments such as a class exercise, test and others will increase their academic achievement.

### **Learning Styles Used by History Students**

Research Question 4 sought to find out the learning styles of history students. This was posed as: What learning styles do history students use in the learning of history?

Items 32 – 43 on the students' questionnaire (See Appendix D) were used to elicit responses in this regard. Students learning styles were evaluated on two scales: audio and visual; active and reflective. Table 14 and 15 display the results.

Table 14

**Audio and Visual Learning Styles**

Item	Mean	Std. Dev.
I prefer verbal instruction	2.55	.99
I prefer to set new information in pictures verbal form	2.97	.99
I prefer to get new information in pictures, diagrams or maps.	3.46	.87
In a book with lots of pictures and charts, I am more likely to focus on the written text.	3.09	1.04
I like teachers who spend a lot of time explaining things to students	3.76	.62
I like teachers who put a lot of diagrams on the board when teaching	3.19	.94

Mean ranges: Not at all (0.00-1.50); somehow (1.60-2.50);much (2.60-3.50) and

Very much (3.60-4.00). Mean of means = 3.09

Mean of standard Deviation = 0.93

The data in Table 14 show that students preferred audio and visual instruction. This means that students employed audio and visual learning styles in the learning of the subject. This is evidenced by the mean of means score of 3.09.

Table 15

**Active and Reflective Learning Styles**

Item	Mean	Std Dev.
I write points down to find if they are right.	2.98	.99
I am more likely to remember something I have done.	3.54	.77
I prefer group brainstorming where everyone contributes ideas.	3.61	.79
The idea of doing work in groups appeal to me.	3.23	.94

Mean ranges: Not at all (0.00-1.50); somehow (1.60-2.50); much (2.60-3.50) and very much (3.60-4.00). Mean of means = 3.34

Mean of standard Deviation = 0.87

There is a preference for active and reflective learning styles (see Table 15). The pattern of preference as shown by the mean of means of 3.34 is that these learning styles are used by students.

Responses to research question four as expressed by students show an almost even use of audio–visual and active–reflective learning styles. However, the mean scores of both scales (audio-visual 3.09 and active–reflective 3.34) shows that history students are slightly more inclined toward active –reflective learning styles.

The learning styles of history students can be described as having a tendency towards analytical skills and the ability to work alone (Johnson & White , 1981), gathering learning through words that they saw and through their sense of hearing (Jonassen & Hodges,1982) and also having a strong tendency towards holistic rather than individualistic learning style (Ford,1985). On the whole, history students are described as fairly well balanced in their learning styles, as shown by

the mean values of 3.09 and 3.34. This implies that history students both acquire information by using it in discussion or experiment and further think about it first and prefer working alone. Again, they acquire information by seeing pictures and get more out of hearing and words. This means that students use audio, visual, active and reflective learning styles.

The results of this study reflect earlier studies (Adkins & Brown- Syed, 2002; Felder, Lee, Litzinger & Wise, 2007) on students' learning styles, which established that senior high school students are fairly well balanced in their learning styles. This is because the results indicate a general preference for audio-visual learning styles, wherein students have a strong orientation towards words that they hear and see, and active- reflective learning in which they are committed to participation and working alone. Since the study was not on any specific discipline, it is assume that history students also learn in a similar way.

If these learning styles are the ones students use, then as Felder and Silverman (1988) and Felder and Brent (2005) argued, instructional methods used by teachers should address the needs of students across the full spectrum of learning styles. This is necessary because the learning styles of most students and teaching styles of most teachers are incompatible in several dimensions resulting in ineffective learning on the part of the students (Felder & Silverman, 1988). It should be noted that learning style and behavioural trends exist, and students from particular socialization and cultural experiences often possess approaches to knowledge that are highly functional in their original living environment and can be capitalized upon to increase performance in an academic setting (Claxton, 1990). Whaley and Smyer (1998) also attest that there is much success when teaching methods focus on individuality of students' learning styles. It is, therefore, important for teachers to identify the students' learning styles in order to

use a suitable teaching method which can lead to an increased comfort and willingness to learn among students. When learning styles of students and the teaching styles of teachers are seriously mismatched, the students are likely to become uncomfortable, bored and inattentive in class, do poorly on tests, get discouraged about the subject, and in some cases drop the subject ( Felder & Spurlin, 2005). What matters is that the teacher should come from a paradigm that supports knowledge construction. Since a person's pedagogical paradigm defines his/her teaching, teachers who come from a constructivist paradigm will naturally use multiple instructional strategies to promote student construction of knowledge and thus enhance the learning of all students.

### **Perceptions of Teachers**

The study again sought to find out if teachers have positive perception of the teaching of history. Hence, research question five was formulated as: What are the perceptions of Teachers of the teaching of history? To answer this question, items 36-50 on the teachers' questionnaire asked respondents to indicate how they perceive the teaching of the subject history. Responses are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

**Teachers' Perceptions of the Teaching of History.**

Statement	SD (F)%	D(F) %	A(F) %	SA(F)%	Mean	Std Dev.
History is a difficult subject to teach	(14)46.7	(12)40.0	(4)13.3	-	1.67	.72
It is very difficult to use variety of methods	(12)40.0	(10)33.3	(6)20.0	(2)6.7	1.93	1.96
I enjoy teaching History	-	(4)13.3	(10)33.3	(16)53.3	3.40	.74
Given the opportunity, I will teach another subject other than history	(14)46.7	(12)40.0	(2)6.7	(2)6.7	1.73	.88
History is best taught by dictating notes for students to write	(18)60.0	(12)40.0	-	-	1.40	.51
History is best taught by narrating past events	(10)33.3	(18)60.0	(2)6.7	-	1.73	.59
History students read their textbooks and look for answers to questions set	(10)33.3	(16)53.3	(2)6.7	(2)6.7	1.87	.83
The teaching of history does not require much deep thinking on my part	(10)33.3	(20)66.7	-	-	1.67	.49

Table 16 continued

Statement	SD(F)%	D(F)%	A(F)%	SA(F)%	Mean	Std Dev
The scope of the subject is too broad to be taught within the time frame	(2)6.7	(6)20.0	(16)53.3	(6)20.0	2.87	.83
The Teaching of history does not require the interpretation of facts for students	(12)40.0	(16)53.3	(2)6.7	-	1.67	.62
Teaching history requires knowledge from other subjects in the social sciences.	-	(2)6.7	(20)66.7	(8)26.7	3.20	.56
History teaching depends on the ability to evaluate different sources of evidence	-	(4)13.3	(20)66.7	(6)20.0	3.07	.59
History teaching requires knowledge of the various patterns of grouping historical facts	(2)6.7	(2)6.7	(18)60.0	(8)26.7	3.70	.80
Teaching history helps instills moral values in students	-	(4)13.3	(10)33.3	(16)53.3	3.40	.74
History requires strong communication skills	-	(2)6.7	(10)33.3	(18)60.0	3.53	.64

Mean ranges: Strongly Disagree (0.00 – 1.50); Disagree (1.60 – 2.50); Agree (2.60 – 3.50); and strongly Agree (3.60 – 4.00).

Mean of Means = 2.41

Mean of Standard Deviation = 0.7

A look at the data shows that teachers have a positive perception of the teaching of history as they disagreed with a lot of the statements which were indicating negative perception of teaching history. For instance, teachers strongly disagreed to statements like, “History is best taught by dictating notes for students to write” (mean of 1.40) and “History is a difficult subject to teach” (mean of 1.67). They also agreed to statements like, “Teaching history requires knowledge from other subjects in the social sciences” (mean of 3.20) and “The teaching of history requires strong communication skills” (mean of 3.53). The result clearly indicates that the direction of the perception of teachers is positive. This is indicated by a mean of means score of 2.41.

The findings imply that teachers have a positive perception of the teaching of history. It can be argued that the positive perception held by teachers is to help build effective collaboration between teachers and students in the teaching environment. Such a situation will make the teaching and learning process more interactive. The result therefore endorses several studies (Moroz, 1995; Holden, 2002; Wolley & Wrang, 2007). These studies concluded that teachers have a positive perception of teaching history.

The findings also demonstrate that a greater number of the respondents, that is 14 (46.7%), strongly disagreed with the idea that given the opportunity they would teach subjects other than history. This may probably mean that history teachers attach great concern to the teaching of the subject. This finding supports



the research finding of Sugerman (2004) that secondary school teachers have substantial concern for teaching Arts related subjects including history.

The results further illustrate that the majority of the respondents 16 (53.3%), strongly agreed to the statement “Teaching history helps instill moral values in students”. Teachers believe that history help inculcate good morals into young ones. The finding therefore concurs with the study of Bever (2004), which concluded that teachers have a positive perception that R.M.E. was a tool for instilling moral virtues in the young. This can also be attributed to history because it also imparts moral values in the young ones (Crookall, 1975).

From the discussion above, it is clear that the general perception history teachers in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana have of their subject is very positive.

### **Perceptions of Students**

The study finally sought to find out if students have positive perception of the learning of history. Hence, research question 6 was posed thus: What are the perceptions of students of the learning of history? To answer this question, Items 44 – 54 of the students’ questionnaire were used. Students were expected to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with given statements. Responses are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

**Students' perceptions of the learning of history**

Statement	SD (F)%	D(F) %	A(F) %	SA(F) %	Mean	Std Dev.
History is a difficult subject to learn	(160)28.1	(270)47.4	(104)18.2	(36)6.3	2.03	.85
History lessons are boring	(228)40.0	(218)38.2	(94)16.5	(30)5.3	1.87	.87
I prefer learning other subjects to history	(166)29.1	(206)36.1	(152)26.1	(46)8.1	2.14	.93
Learning history demands a lot of efforts than other subjects	(56)9.8	(126)22.1	(236)41.4	(152)26.7	2.85	.93
Learning history is all about memorization of facts	(40)7.0	(52)9.1	(232)40.7	(246)43.2	3.20	.88
Studying history is about learning past things	(24)4.2	(42)7.4	(194)34.4	(310)54.4	3.39	.80
Learning history is about listening to the teacher as he/she teaches	(92)16.1	(88)15.4	(234)41.1	(156)27.4	2.80	1.02

Table 17 continued

Statement	SD	D(F) %	A(F) %	SA(F) %	Mean	Std
	(F)%					Dev.
Learning history does calls for evaluation of evidences/records	(16)2.8	(38)6.7	(232)40.7	(284)49.8	3.36	.73
Studying history does calls for critical thinking	(28)4.9	(52)9.1	(230)40.1	(260)45.6	3.27	.82
Studying history does not require the application of knowledge	(20)3.3	(42)7.4	(230)40.4	(278)48.8	3.34	.77
Learning history does not require the determination of similarities and differences in historical facts	(30)5.3	(60)10.5	(294)51.6	(186)32.6	3.12	.79

Mean ranges: Strongly Disagree (0.00 – 1.50); Disagree (1.60 – 2.50); Agree (2.60 – 3.50); and strongly Agree (3.60 – 4.00).

Mean of Means = 2.85

Mean of Standard Deviation = 0.85

Generally, data in Table 17 show that students have a negative perception of the learning of history. This is because students agreed to the statements which indicate the wrong ways in which history is perceived. For instance, responses to the statement, “Studying history is about learning past things” had a mean score of 3.39. Again, in reaction to the statement, “Learning history is about memorization of facts”, a mean score of 3.20 was recorded. The overall results show that the direction of students’ perception of learning history is negative. This is indicated by the mean of means score of 2.85. Though this mean score falls within the ‘agree’ range, however it represents a negative perception because all the statements indicate negative perceptions of history to which the students agreed to.

The findings support the findings of a research by Moroz (1995) and Germanou (2007) that history students have a negative perception of the learning of history. This may be the general perception of history that the subject history is about “dead people”. It can also be that students were not given good and proper orientation and teaching in their social studies subject, in which history is located, during their basic education.

Students notion that studying history is about learning past things, which registered a mean of means score of 3.39, is in consonance with Shemilt (2000) assertion, that students perceive the study of history as a presentation of a uniform picture of the past. With this view at the back of their mind, students tended to see

the subject as uninteresting, unimportant and insignificant as concluded by Shaver, Davis & Helburn (1979) and Schug, Todd & Beery (1984).

Similarly, respondents answered in the affirmative to the idea that learning history is all about memorization of facts. It seems to be that students see history as names and dates to be memorized for examination. This endorses the study of Ragland (2007) that history students tended to see history as a series of dates, names, and places lacking meaning or relevance, and is learnt by memorization. This is also in line with the conversation that Holt's (1990) had with history students who indicated that they view history as a story which need to be memorized to pass an examination.

A mean score of 2.03 was recorded for the statement; "History is difficult to learn". This signals that students perceive history as difficult to learn as concluded in a research work of Germanou (2007). Respondents also tended to perceive history as a boring subject. This is in line with the study of Shaughnessy and Haladyna (1985) that students perceived social studies, which is history oriented, as a boring subject.

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that the general perception of the learning of history by history students in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana is very negative.

### **Other Findings**

Tables 18 and 19 present respondents views on the periods devoted to the teaching of history and their ratings of the periods.

Table 18

**Respondents' Views on the Periods Devoted to Teaching of History Per Week in Schools**

Item	Respondents	2periods (F)%	3periods (F)%	4periods (F)%	5periods (F)%	6periods (F)%
Number of periods devoted to teaching history per week in schools	T  S	(2)6.65  (68)11.9	(2)6.65  (144)25	(4)13.3  (122)21.4	(6)20.0  (100)17.5	(16)53  (122)21

As reported in Table 18, the highest number of periods devoted to the teaching of history in schools as expressed by teacher is 6 periods per week. This recorded a percentage score of 53.3%. However students' response indicates that the number of periods devoted to the teaching of history is '3periods' per week as supported by a percentage score of 25%.

The results, therefore, indicate that the views of teachers and students are at variance. Clearly, the differences in opinion are clarified by a school observation. A look at the school timetable in ten selected schools shows that indeed periods devoted to the teaching of history in most schools are '3 periods per week'. However, it has been suggested in the history syllabus that history be allocated six periods a week with each period consisting of 40 minutes. It is also suggested that the periods should be organised into three double periods.

Table 19

**Respondents' Rating of Periods Allocated for Teaching History**

Item	Respondent	Very Inadequate (F)%	Inadequate (F)%	Adequate (F)%	Very Adequate (F)%
How will you rate the periods allocated for teaching history	T S	(2)6.7 (68)11.9	(20)66.7 (186)32.6	(8)26.7 (216)37.9	- (100)17.5

As shown in Table 19, the majority of the teachers, that is 10 (66.7%), rated the periods allocated for the teaching of history as 'inadequate'. On the other hand, the majority of students, 108 (37.9%), rated the periods as 'adequate'. However, a look at the scope of the history syllabus as compared with the teaching periods devoted to the teaching of history in schools, shows that the periods allocated to history on the time table of most schools is inadequate.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the research process and its findings. It also draws conclusions and makes recommendations for practice and for future research.

#### **Summary of the Research Process.**

The main focus of the study was to evaluate the teaching and learning of history in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana.

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What teaching techniques do history teachers use during history lesson?
2. What teaching and learning resources are available for history lessons?
3. What instruments do history teachers employ to assess students' learning outcomes in the subject?
4. What learning styles do history students use in the learning of history?
5. What are the perceptions of teachers of the teaching of history?
6. What are the perceptions of students of the learning of history?

The descriptive survey was used to gather the necessary information. In all, six hundred (600) respondents were used for the study. This comprised thirty (30) teachers and five hundred and seventy (570) students, which constituted the



population for the study. The simple random sampling was used to select students for the study while census method was used to select all the history teachers in the schools.

Two (2) main instruments – questionnaire and observation guide were used together with documentary evidence. Two sets of questionnaire were designed for history teachers and students to seek their views on the teaching and learning of history. The items were designed on a Likert-type scale. The internal consistency reliability co-efficient of the questionnaire was .735. The observation guide sought information on classroom interaction between teachers and students. The researcher analysed available documents which helped in verifying the extent to which the teaching and learning of history conformed to stipulated practice.

Research questions were analysed using frequencies, percentages and the mean of means. In the next paragraphs, the main findings of the study are presented.

### **Main Findings**

The main findings of the study were as follows:

1. History teachers most frequently used the question and answer, discussion and lecture methods. However, these methods were not used appropriately by teachers. Methods such as debate, role-play, discovery and field trips were not used frequently by history teachers.
2. With the exception of history textbooks, other instructional resources such as audio, visual and audio-visual materials needed for the teaching and learning of the subject, were not available or woefully inadequate in the schools. Textbooks which were found dominating most of the lessons were

also not used appropriately. The absence of such resources like audio, visual and audio-visual indeed hindered the effective teaching of the subject.

3. History teachers used traditional forms of assessment such as class texts and class exercises, to the neglect of other assessment instruments such as performance, authentic and alternative assessments.
4. History students were fairly well balanced in their learning styles, with a general use of both audio-visual and active-reflective learning styles.
5. History teachers in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana had a favourable or positive perception of the teaching of history.
6. History students had an unfavourable or negative perception of the learning of history.

### **Conclusions**

From the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. History teachers are selective when they are adopting instructional methods for their lessons. They usually choose methods that are easy to deliver to the disadvantage of students' thorough understanding.
2. History teachers and students alike are too limited to the use of only history textbooks. This therefore limits teachers' and students' ability to use a variety of teaching approaches or learning styles to effectively perform.
3. The use of traditional forms of assessment to the neglect of other modes by history teachers, fails to prepare students fully, the aftermath of which is rote learning.

4. Generally, history students have multiple learning styles that are combined to position them strategically to assimilate lessons. Therefore, they are responsive to varied teaching methods
5. Despite students' apparent disinterest in history, history teachers are really enthusiastic about the teaching of history.
6. History students have a negative perception of learning history, hence the development of disinterest in its study and subsequent poor performance in the subject coupled with diminished enrolment

### **Recommendations**

In the light of the findings and conclusions outlined, the following recommendations are made:

1. In respect of the methods used by history teachers, it is suggested that the Ghana Education Service organize periodic in-service training for history teachers to help improve the teaching of history. This will help teachers avoid teacher-centred approaches and instead focus on learner-centred approaches.
2. Teachers should engage students in practical and meaningful debates, role-play, and field trips as often as possible. Through such interactive methods, the history teacher can widen the horizon of his/her students, quicken their imaginations and develop in them critical thinking, and in that way perfect the historical knowledge which the students had developed in their junior high school social studies course. Again, incorporating some of these methods into the teaching of history may further the aim of accommodating all learners with respect to the way they learn.

3. There is the need for adequate provision and supply of instructional resources to schools by the Ministry of Education for effective teaching and learning. With the state of the economy, it is suggested that history teachers be trained to develop and improvise some of the materials for teaching.
4. History teachers should use a variety of meaningful and engaging assessment opportunities: traditional- to capture *breadth* of knowledge and authentic- to capture *depth* of knowledge and understanding. This balance of assessment opportunities will help portray a fair and complete picture of the students.
5. The Ministry of Education, the Ghana Education Service and the Ghana Historical Association should inspire students so that they develop positive perception of the subject. Again, history teachers should conduct their teaching in such a manner that it is interactive, inductive and student – centred.
6. School heads should be vigilant to ensure that history lessons be allocated six periods per week as suggested in the history syllabus so that a large proportion of the content could be covered. Circuit supervisors should be made to go round by their directors to ensure that this is adhered to.

#### **Areas for Further Research.**

The study evaluated the teaching and learning of history in Senior High Schools in the Central Region of Ghana. The following areas are suggested for further research:

1. A replication of the current study on a nation – wide basis by the Ghana Education Service or any interested organisation or individual will be

commendable. This, it is hoped, will provide a more in-depth study into issues relating to the teaching and learning of history.

2. Further research should look at students' rating of history teachers' effectiveness. This will help stakeholders know whether teachers employed to teach the subject are effective or not.

## REFERENCES

- Abma, T. A. (2005). *Responsive evaluation: Its meaning and special contribution to health promotion*. Netherlands: University of Manstricht Press.
- Adejunmobi, S. A. (1978). Some methods of high school history teaching. In S.A. Adejunmbi (Ed.). *A handbook of high school history teaching*. Ibadan: Department of Teacher Education, University of Ibadan.
- Adeyinka, A. A. (1990). *The objective and methods of history teaching in Kwara State senior secondary schools*. Nigeria: University of Ilorin.
- Adkins, D & Brown-Syed, C. (2002). Accommodating all learners. *Critical inquiry and learning styles in the LIS classroom*, 11(2), 047-093.
- American Historical Association (2003). *Dictionary of American history*. New York: The Gale Groups Inc.
- Annobil, K. N. (2004). *Evaluating the implementation process of the junior secondary school religious and moral education programme*. University of Cape Coast: Unpublished M.Phil Thesis.
- Anti, K. K. & Anum, E. B. (2003). *Religious and Moral Education for Diploma in Basic Education*. Cape Coast: University of Cape Coast.
- Ari, R. (2007). *Assessment*. Stockholm: University Press.
- Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (3Ed) (1965). *The teaching of history in secondary schools*. Cambridge University Press.
- Awuah, G. (2000). *Religious and moral education for teachers*. Kumasi: ED-JAY.

- Baker, R & Moroz, W. (1997). Student and teacher perception of teaching/learning process in classroom: How close is the partnership? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 22(1), 47-85
- Bam, J & Visser, P. (2002). *A new history for a new South Africa*. Cape Town: Kagiso.
- Barbe, W. B., Swassing, R. H. & Milone, M. N. (1979). Teaching through modality strengths: Concepts and practices. *Zamer Blosler*, 40(2), 13-19.
- Bever, M. (2004). *Assessment of teachers' perception and attitude towards moral education*. University of Wisconsin: Unpublished M.Phil Thesis.
- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the students does*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Breitsprecher, W. P. (2005). *Self knowledge: Today's collegian*. Available at <http://www.ericdigests.org/1998-1/history.htm>. Retrieved on January 15, 2009.
- Bruce, F. (1987). School effects in the third world. *Review of educational research fall*, 57(3), 255-295
- Burston, W. H. (1972). *Principles of history teaching*. London: Methuen Education.
- Cahen, L. S., Filby, N., McLutcheon, G. & Ihyle, D. W (1983). *Class size and Instruction*. New York, N.Y. Longman Press.
- California Department of Education (2003). *Criteria for evaluating instructional materials in History-Social Sciences*. California: University of California.

- Cameron, J. & Debra, K. (2000). *The artist's way: A spiritual path to higher creativity*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Chaffer, J & Taylor, J. (1975). *History and the history teacher*. London: Allen and Urwin Ltd.
- Claxton, C. S. (1990). Learning styles, minority students and effective education. *Journal of developmental education*, 41(1), 6-8.
- Cobbold, C. (1999). *Implementation of the social studies programme in teacher training college in Ghana: An evaluation*. University of Cape Coast: Unpublished M.Phil Thesis.
- Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (1992). Reassessing assessment. In A. L. Costa, J. A. Bellanca, & R. Fogarty, (Eds.), *If minds matter: A forward to the future, Volume II* (pp. 275-280). Palatine, IL: IRI/Skylight Publishing.
- Costa, A. L. (1998). Teacher behavior that enable student thinking. In A.L. Costa (Ed.), *Developing mind: A resource book for teaching thinking* (Vol. 1). Virginia: Colin Publishers.
- Crandall, D & Associates. (1982). *People, policies and practice: Examining the chain of school improvement*. Andover: The Network.
- Creswell, J.W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative research and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Merrill/ Hall.
- Cullen, B. (1998). Brainstorming before speaking tasks. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 4(7).
- Crookall, R.E. (1975). *Handbook for history teachers in Africa*. London: Evans.
- Dance, E. H. (1970). *The Place of history in secondary teaching: A comparative study*. London: George G Harrap & Co.



- Deavler, R. (2007). *Learning styles and the collegiate*. Voile Studio Supplementary material. Northeast Chapter.
- Dobson-Lewis, M. C. (2008). *Alternative assessment: An Action Research Study on the use of Peer Assessment as a Learning Tool for Education Students in a University in Jamaica*. EABR & TLC conference proceeding. Rothenburg, Germany.
- Doolittle, P. & Hicks, D. (2003). Constructivism as a theoretical foundation for the use of technology education. *Theory and Research in Education*, 31(1), 72-104.
- Drake, F. D. (1997). Using alternative assessments to improve the teaching and learning of history. *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education Bloomington IN. available at <http://www.ericdigests.org/1998-1/history.htm>. Retrieved January 26, 2007
- Dunn, T. K. (1998). *Mathematics teaching and learning in an alternative high school program: A qualitative study of preservice teachers and learners* Washington State University: Ph.D. dissertation.
- Dwarko, D. A. (2007). History-The ailing subject: The need for revival in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In D. E. K. Amenumey (pp.167-178). *Challenges of Education in Ghana in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Woeli Publishing Services. Accra.
- Educational Product Exchange Institute (1977). *Report on a national study of the nature and quality of instructional materials most used by teachers and learners*. No.76.
- Farlow, R. L. K. (2002). Teachers' perception of moral education. Implications for staff development. *Journal of Moral education*, 62(8), 12-21.

- Farrant, J. S. (1980). *Principles and practice of education*. Singapore: Longman Singapore Publishers.
- Felder, R. M & Brent, B. (2005). Understanding student difference. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 57-72.
- Felder, R. M & Silverman, L. K. (1988). Learning and teaching styles in engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 78(7), 674-681.
- Felder, R. M., & Spurlin, J. (2005). Applications, reliability, and validity of the Index of Learning Styles. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 21, 103-112.
- Felder, R. M & Solomon, B. A. (2000). *Learning styles and strategies*. Available at [www.2.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/t/felder/public/ILSdir/styles.htm](http://www2.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/t/felder/public/ILSdir/styles.htm). Retrieved on January 15, 2009.
- Fessler, R. & Christansen, J. (1992). *The teacher career cycle: Understanding and guiding the professional development of teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Fieldman, R. (1987). *Understanding psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Fink, L.R. (2001). *How to sample in survey*. California: Age Publications Inc.
- Ford, N. (1985). Styles and strategies of processing information. *Education for Information*, 3,(2), 115-132.
- Fraenkel, J. R & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Francis, P. J & Bryne, P. A. (1999). *Use of Role-playing exercises in teaching undergraduate astronomy and physics*. Australian National University: Dept. of Physics and Theory, Faculty of Science.
- Gagne, R. M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction*. (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.), New York: Lawrence Erlbaum

- Gatawa, B. S. M. (1990). *Principles and Practice of Education*. Zimbabwe: Harare Longman.
- Gay, R. L. (1992). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York: Merrill/Macmillan.
- Gellenstien, N.L. (2004). Creative Discover through Classification. *Teaching children mathematics*, 11(3), 103-4.
- Germanou, V. N. ((2007). *Teaching and Learning History in Cyprus Secondary Educational level: What are students& perceptions of History and History Teaching*. University of Hull: ME.d. Dissertation.
- Ghana Education Service (2008). *Teaching Syllabus for History*. Accra: Curriculum Research and Development Division.
- Gibson, L. & Spelke, L. (1983). *Measurement of perception and attitude*. London: Sages Publication.
- Gohm, C. L., Humphreys, L. G., & Yao, G. (1998). Underachievement among spatially gifted students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35, 515-531.
- Gosden, P.H.J.H & Sylvester, D.W. (1968). *History for the average child*. London: Alden and Mowbray Ltd.
- Grant, S. G., Gradwell, J. M., Lauricella, A. M., Derme-Insinna, A., Pullano, L.,& Tzetzso, K. (2002). When increasing stakes need not mean increasing standards: The case of the New York state global history and geography exam. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(4), 488-515.
- Grant, S. G & Gradwell, J .M. (2008). Identifying the Markers of History: Teachers and Researchers Describe the Assessment of Historical Knowledge and Understanding. *Social Studies Research and Practice*. 33(2), 244-265.

- Gronlund, N. E. (1996). *Assessment of student achievement* (7th ed.), Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gronlund, N. E. (2003). *Assessment of student achievement* (7th ed.), Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gronlund, N. E. (2006). *Assessment of student achievement* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson Publishers.
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or Praxis*. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis Inc.
- Hagedorn, H. J. (1976). *A working manual of simple program evaluation techniques for community mental health centers*. Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, Rockville.
- Hancock, C. R (1994). Alternative assessment and second language study: What and why? *Online Resources: Digests*. Available at <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/hanoc01.html>. Retrieved July 26, 2007
- Harris, P. Research Groups. (2002). *Survey of California Teachers*. California: Pearson Groups.
- Harris, R. J and Haydn, T. (2006). Pupil perceptions of history as a school subject. In, *ECER 2006 Geneva. European Conference on Educational Research Geneva 2006, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-16 Sep 2006* (p.19). Glasgow: European Educational Research Association.
- Heynaeman, S., Farrell, J., & Sepulveda-Stuart, M. (1978). Textbooks and achievement: What we know: *World Bank staff working paper*. No.289. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Heywood, J. (2000). *Assessment in higher education: Student learning, teaching, programs and institutions*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Hopkins, D. (1989). *Evaluation for school development*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Holden, L. (2002). Perception of teachers about moral education in urban high schools. *Journal of Moral Education*, 12(4), 24-28.
- Holt, T. (1990). *Thinking historically: Narrative, imagination, and understanding*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Huberman, A. M. (1983). School improvement strategies that work: Scenarios. *Educational leadership*, 41(3), 23-27.
- Jagger, S. (2000). *Approaches and guidelines for teaching an undergraduate at Roehampton University*. London: Roehampton University.
- Jamieson, A. (1971). *Practical history teaching*. London: Evans.
- Jarolimick, J. & Foster, C. D. (1989). *Teaching and learning in the elementary school*. London: Macmillan
- Johnson, H. (1940). *Teaching of history*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Johnson, K. A. & White, M. D. (1981). *Cognitive style in library/information science education*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California. ERIC # 203 863.
- Jonassen, D. H. & Hodges, G. G. (1982). Student cognitive styles: implications for library educators. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 22, 143- 153.
- Kam-Fai, H. (1973). Preferred teaching method: *Lecture, Discussion or Tutorial*. 4(1), 1-22.
- Karge, B. (1998). Knowing what to teach: Using authentic assessment to improve classroom instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 14, 319-331.

- Kelly, A.V. (1989). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*. London: Paul  
Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Kimble, H. & Mackaeachie, P. (1960). *Students motivation, cognition and learning*.  
New York: Lawerance Erlbaum Associates.
- Kundu, C. & Tutoo, W. D. (1988). *Educational psychology*. New Delhi: Sterling  
Publishers Ltd.
- Lee, J. K & Doolittle, P. E. (2006). *Social Studies and History teachers' use of non-  
digital and digital historical resources*, 1(3), 1933-5415.
- Levin, M & Lockheed, M. (1991). *Effective schools in developing countries*.  
Washington, D.C: Falmer Press.
- Lewy, A. (1977). *Handbook on Curriculum Evaluation*. New York:  
UNESCO
- Lewy, A. (Ed) (1999) *The International Encyclopaedia of Curriculum*. London:  
Pergamon
- Little, G. R (1999). Paper 1: *A theory of perception*. Available at  
[www.grlphilosophy.co.nz/paper\\_1.htm](http://www.grlphilosophy.co.nz/paper_1.htm) Retrieved on February 18,2008
- Lee, S. H., Litzinger, T. A., Wise, J. C. & Felder, R. M. (2005). *A study of the  
reliability and validity of the Felder-Soloman Index of Learning Styles*.  
Paper presented at the ASEE Annual Conference, Portland.
- Loftus, E. & Worthman, C. (1988). *Psychology*. New York: Alfred A.  
Knoff Inc.
- Manoron, K. & Pollock, Z. (2006). *Role play as a teaching method: A practical  
guide*. Mekong sub-region social research centre. Faculty of Liberal Arts,  
Ratchthani University.

- Mathew, M. M. (1966). *Teaching to read: Historically considered*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Mayers, R.E. (2003). *Learning and instruction*. Pearson Education. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.
- Ministry of Education, (1994). *Report of the education commission on education in morals and ethics*. Ghana: Teacher Education Division.
- Morris, R. V. (2001). Drama and authentic assessment in a social studies classroom. *Social Studies*, 92, 41-44.
- Moroz, W., Baker, R. G. & McDonald, G. (1995). *Year-level differences in student attitudes toward social studies and other school subjects*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education. Hobart, November, 1995.
- Mumuni, T, (2006). *Teachers' and students' perception of and attitude towards the religious and moral education programme in selected senior secondary schools in the upper east region of Ghana*. University of Cape Coast: Unpublished M. Phil Thesis.
- Myers, C. (1986). *Teaching students to think critically*. San Francisco: Jessey-Bass Publishers.
- Nacino-Brown, R., Oke, F. E & Brown, D. P. (1990). *Curriculum and instruction: An introduction to methods of teaching*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- National Cancer Institute (1992). *A planner's Guide*. Publication No. 921493.
- National Center for History in Schools (1996). *National History Standards*. Los Angeles: National Center for History Schools.

- National Council for Social Studies (1994). *Expectations for excellence Curriculum Standards for Social Studies*. Washington ,D.C: National Council for Social Studies.
- Nickell, P. (1993). Alternative assessment: Implications for social studies. *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education Bloomington IN. Available at <http://www.ericdigests.org/1993/social.htm>. Retrieved January 17, 2007.
- Nitko, A. J. (2004). *Educational assessment of students* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Oakes, J & Saunders, M. (2002). *Access to textbooks, instructional materials, equipment, and technology: Inadequacy and inequality in California's Public Schools*. Los Angles: UCL Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access.
- Odamtten, S.K. (1993).*The delight in teaching and learning history*. Accra.
- Ofstead, K. (2005). The annual report: *History in secondary schools*. London: HMSO.
- Owen, J. M. & Rogers, P. J. (1999). *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches*. London: Sage Publication.
- Pamela, M. (1974). *Why teach history: Unibooks*. London: University of London Press.
- Popham, W. J. (2005). *Classroom assessment: What teachers need to know*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pratt, D. (1980). *Curriculum: Design and development*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.



- Prestidge, L. K. & Glaser, C. H. (2000). Authentic assessment: Employing appropriate tools for evaluating students' work in 21st-century classrooms [Electronic version]. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 35, 178-182.
- Qualters, D. (2001). Do students want to be active? *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 51-60.
- Ragland, R. G. (2007). Changing Secondary Teachers' Views of Teaching American History. *Journal of History Education*, 40(2), 9-6.
- Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning and teaching in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Rand (2002). *Annual report on the availability of instructional materials in California Schools. Objectives, Analysis and Effective Solutions*. Washington D. C.: Rand Corporation.
- Renzulli, J.S., Smith, L.H. (1978). *The Learning Styles Inventory: A measure of student preference for instructional techniques*. Mansfield: Creative Learning Press.
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social research* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) London: Macmillan Press.
- Schug, M.C., Todd, R.J. & Beery, R. (1984). Why kids don't like social studies. *Social education*, 11(5), 382-387.
- Scriven, M. (1967). *The Methodology of Evaluation*. Rand McNally, Chicago, Illinois.
- Scriven, M. (1972). *Evaluating action programs*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Seixas, P. (2000). Scweign! Die Kinder! Or Does Postmodern History has a place in the schools? In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S, Wineburg (Eds). *Knowing, teaching and learning history* (pp.19-37). New York: New York University Press.

- Shapiro, J. (1996). *Evaluation: Judgment and Day or Management*. Johannesburg: Civicus.
- Shaughnessy, J.M. & Haladyna, T.M. (1985). Research on student attitude toward social studies. *Social education*, 48(8), 692-695.
- Shaver, J.P., Davis, Jr, O.L., & Helburn, S.W. (1979). The status of social studies education: Impressions from three NSF studies. *Social education*, 43, 150-153.
- Shemilt, D. (2000). The caliph's coin: The currency of narrative frameworks in history teaching. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 83-101). New York: New York University Press.
- Silverman, L. K. (2000). Identifying visual and auditory- sequential learners: A validation study. In N. Colango & S. G. Assouline (Eds), *Talent development: Proceedings from the 2000 Henry B. and Jocelyn Wallace National Research Symposium on Talent Development*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gifted Psychology Press.
- Silver, H. (2004). *Evaluation Research in Education*. Plymouth: University of Plymouth.
- Smith, L. K. (2002). *Reconceptualizing context from a situated perspective: Teacher beliefs and the activity of teaching within the context of science reform*. The University of Utah: Unpublished PhD Dissertation.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). *The countenance of educational evaluation*. Chicago: University of Illinois.

- Stake, R. E. (1972). *Responsive evaluation* (Mimeographed). Urbana-Champaign: Centre for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois.
- Steffy, B. E. (1989). *Career Stages of Classroom Teachers*. Lancaster: Technomic Publishing Company.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.
- Stetcher, B. (1991). "Goal-Free Evaluation". In A. Lewy (Ed), *The International Encyclopaedia of Curriculum*. (pp. 413-414). London: Pergamon.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). *Educational evaluation and decision making*. Hasca Illinois: F.E. Peacock.
- Sugerman, B. (2004). Perception of Secondary School teachers concerning religious education. *Journal of Religious Education*, 29(2), 5-12.
- Taba H. (1962). *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice* New York: Harcourt; Brace and World Inc.
- Tamakloe, E.K. Amedahe, F.K. Atta, E.T. (2005) *Principles and methods of teaching*. Accra: Ghana University Press.
- Tanner, D & Tanner, L. (1995). *Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). New Jersey: Merrill.
- Tyler, R.W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Urnstated, J. G. (1964). *College teaching: Background, Theory and Practice*. Washington D.C.: The University Press of Washington, D.C.
- Weatherly, M. S. (1989). "Meet Eminent Persons from the Past . . . a People Fair." *Gifted Child Today*, 12(4), 30-31.

- Wells, J. (1987). *The curriculum in nursing education*. London: Routledge Francis Groups.
- Whaley, A & Smyer, D. (1998). Self-evaluation processes of African American youth in a high school completion program. *The Journal of psychology*, 132(2), 317-327.
- Woodward, A. & Elliot, D. L. (1990). Textbooks use and teacher professionalism. In Elliot, D.L & Woodward (Eds). *Textbooks and schooling in the United State* (pp. 178-193). Chicago: National Society for the study of education.
- Wang, C M., Haertel, G. D. & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Synthesis of research: What helps students to learn? *Educational leadership*, 63(3), 224-294.
- Wolley & Wrang. (2007). Assessing the factorial structure of high school history teachers' perception on history teaching. *Teacher Development*, 10(3), 379-391
- World Bank (2004). *The International Bank for Reconstruction*. New York: World Bank

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

*Department of Arts & Social Sciences Education*

TELEPHONE: +233 42 35411/ +233 42 32480/

EXT. (268), Direct: 35411.

Telegrams & Cables: University, Cape Coast.



University Post Office,  
Cape Coast, Ghana.

**OUR REF: DASSE/111**

**YOUR REF:**

**2009**

*Date: 4<sup>th</sup> February,*

---

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN  
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

The bearer of this letter, Mr. Charles Oppong Adabo, is a graduate student of the Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. He requires some information from your institution for the purpose of writing a thesis as a requirement of M.Phil Degree programme.

I should be grateful if you would kindly allow him to collect the information from your institution. Kindly give the necessary assistance that Mr. Adabo requires to collect the information.

While anticipating your co-operation, I thank you for any help that you may be able to give.

**DR. YAW AFARI ANKOMAH**  
**HEAD OF DEPARTMENT**

## APPENDIX B

LIST OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS READING HISTORY IN THE CENTRAL  
REGION OF GHANA.

NO	DISTRICT	NAME OF SCHOOL
1	Abura/Asebu/Kwamankese	Aburaman Secondary
2	Agona District	Swedru Secondary of Business
3	Ajumako/Enyan/Essiam District	Besease Secondary/Commercial Enyan Denkyira Secondary School Mando Secondary Technical School
4	Asikuma/Odoben/Brakwa District	Breman Asikuma Secondary School
5	Assin North and South Districts	Assin Manso Secondary School Obiri Yeboah Secondary School Adakwaman Secondary/commercial Carolyn Stroman Senior High
6	Awutu/Efutu/Senya District	Winneba Secondary School
7	Cape Coast Metropolis	Adisadel College Academy of Christ the King Ghana National College Holy Child Secondary School

---

		Mfantshipim School
		Saint Augustine's College
		University Practice Secondary School
		Wesley Girls' High School
		Effutu Secondary/Technical
		Harris Senior High School
	Gomoa District	Apam Secondary School
8		Charity International Senior High
	Komenda/Edina/Eguafo/Abirem District	Edinaman Day Secondary School
9		
	Mfantshiman District	Saltpond Methodist High School
10		Kwegyir Aggrey Secondary School
		Mankessim Secondary/Technical
		Jukwa Senior High
	Twifo/Hemang/Lower Denkyira District	Twifo Praso Secondary School
11		Boa-Amponsem Secondary School
		Blessed Tutorial College
	Upper Denkyira District	
12		

---





3. Age
- Below 20 years [ ]
  - 21 – 30 years [ ]
  - 31 – 40 years [ ]
  - 41 – 50 years [ ]
  - 51 – 60 years [ ]
  - 60 years and above [ ]
4. Your academic qualification.
- SSCE [ ]
  - GCE ‘O’ Level [ ]
  - GCE ‘A’ Level [ ]
  - Diploma [ ]
  - Bachelor Degree [ ]
  - Masters Degree [ ]
  - Other [ ] (Specify).....
5. Your professional qualification.
- Cert ‘A’ [ ]
  - PDGE [ ]
  - B.Ed [ ]
  - M.Ed/M.Phil [ ]
  - Others [ ] Specify.....
6. How long have you been teaching history?
- Less than 1 year [ ]
  - 1 – 5 years [ ]
  - 6 – 10 years [ ]
  - 11 – 15 years [ ]

16 – 20 years [ ]

21 years and above [ ]

SECTION B

TEACHING TECHNIQUES/METHODS

How often do you employ each of the following teaching techniques/strategies/methods in your teaching?

Please tick [√] the appropriate column

No.	Technique	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Regularly	Coding Do not write here
7.	Discussion					
8.	Field work					
9.	Dramatization/role play					
10.	Questions and Answers					
11.	Lecture method					
12.	Discovery method					
13.	Activity method					
14.	Debate					
15.	Brainstorming					

SECTION C

TEACHING – LEARNING RESOURCES

Please, tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate the teaching-learning resources available to you for the teaching and learning of history.

No.	Resource/Material	Available and adequate	Available but not adequate	Not available at all	Coding do not write here
16.	History Syllabus				
17.	History textbooks				
18.	Teachers' Guide				
19.	Audio materials e.g. cassette players, radios, etc.				
20.	Visual materials e.g. maps, charts, pictures etc.				
21.	Audio-Visual materials e.g. television, filmstrips, slide projectors etc.				

Please, tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate how often you use each of the available resources/materials in your history lesson?

No.	Resource/Material	Not used	Occasionally used	Often used	Very often	Coding
22.	History syllabus					
23.	History teachers					
24.	Teachers' Guide					

25.	Audio materials e.g. radio					
26.	Visual materials e.g. maps, chart					
27.	Audio-visual materials e.g. Video Clips					

SECTION D

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS FOR HISTORY

Please, tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate how often you use each of the assessment procedures in the teaching of history.

No.	Assessment Instrument	Not used	Occasionally used	Often used	Very often used	Coding Do not write here
28.	Class test					
29.	Class exercise					
30.	Home work					
31.	Investigative study					
32.	Project work					
33.	Group assignment					
34.	Oral question					
35.	Individual presentation					

## SECTION E:

## PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

Please, tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate whether you: strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree or strongly Agree to the following statements.

No.	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Coding do not write here
36.	History is a difficult subject to teach					
37.	It is very difficult to use varied methods in the teaching of history					
38.	I enjoy teaching history					
39.	Given the opportunity, I will teach another subject other than history					
40.	History is best taught by dictating notes for students to write					
41.	History is best taught by narrating past					

	events					
42.	History is taught by asking students to read their textbooks and look for answers to set questions.					
43.	The teaching of history does not require much deep thinking on my part.					
44.	The scope of the subject is too broad to be taught within the time frame.					
45.	The teaching of history does not require the interpretation of facts for students.					
46.	Teaching history requires knowledge from other subjects in the social sciences.					
47.	Teaching history helps instill moral values in					

	students					
48.	History teaching requires knowledge of the various patterns of grouping historical facts.					
49.	Teaching history require objective analysis of facts.					
50.	The teaching of history requires strong communication skills.					

51. Please, tick [] the appropriate box to indicate the period (s) devoted to the teaching of history per work in your school.

1 period      []

2 periods     []

3 periods     []

4 periods     []

5 periods     []

6 periods     []

52. How would you rate the periods allocated for the teaching of history considering the scope of the history syllabus?

Very Inadequate [] Inadequate [] Adequate [] Very Adequate []





SECTION B

TEACHING TECHNIQUES/METHODS

Please tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate how often your teacher uses each of the following teaching techniques/methods/strategies to teach the history subject?

No.	Technique	Never	Rarely	Occasioally	Regularly	Coding Do not write here
5.	Discussion					
6.	Field work					
7.	Dramatization/role play					
8.	Questions and Answers					
9.	Lecture method					
10.	Discovery method					
11.	Activity method					
12.	Debate					
13.	Brainstorming					

SECTION C

TEACHING - LEARNING RESOURCES

Please tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate the teaching-learning resources available in your school for the teaching and learning of history.

No.	Resource/Materials	Available and adequate	Available not Adequate	Not available at all	Coding Do not write here
14.	History Syllabus				
15.	History Textbook				
16.	Teachers' Guide				
17.	Audio materials e.g. cassette players, radios etc.				
18.	Visual materials e.g. maps, charts, pictures etc.				
19.	Audio-Visual materials e.g. television, filmstrips, slide projectors etc.				

Please tick [√] the appropriate column in respect to how often your history teacher uses each of the available resources/materials in his /her teaching.

No.	Resources/Materials	Not used	Occasionally used	Often used	Very often used	Coding Do not write here
20.	History textbooks					
21.	Audio materials e.g.					

	radio					
22.	Visual materials e.g. maps, chart.					
23.	Audio-visual materials e.g. video clips.					

SECTION D

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS FOR HISTORY

Please tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate how often your teacher uses each of these assessment procedures.

No.	Assessment Procedure	Not used	Occasionally used	Often used	Very often used	Coding Do not write here
24.	Class test					
25.	Class Exercise					
26.	Home work					
27.	Investigative study					
28.	Project work					
29.	Group assignment					
30.	Oral questions					
31.	Individual presentation					

SECTION E

LEARNING TECHNIQUES/STYLES

Please tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate the extent to which each of these affects you.

No.	Technique/Style	Not All	At Some How	Much	Very Much	Coding Do not write here
32.	I prefer verbal instructions.					
33.	I prefer to get new information in verbal form.					
34.	I prefer to get new information in pictures, diagrams or maps.					
35.	In a book with lots of pictures and charts, I am more likely to focus on the written text.					
36.	I like teachers who spend a lot of time explaining things to students.					
37.	I like teachers who put a lot of diagrams on the board when teaching.					
38.	I write words down to find if they are					

	right.					
39.	I remember best what I did together with my friends.					
40.	I prefer written instructions.					
41.	I am more likely to remember something I have done.					
42.	I prefer group brainstorming where everyone contributes ideas.					
43.	The idea of doing work in groups appeals to me.					

SECTION F:

PERCEPTION OF THE LEARNING OF HISTORY

Please tick [√] the appropriate column to indicate whether you: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree or Strongly Agree the following statements.

No.	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Coding Do not write
44.	History is a difficult subject to learn					
45.	History lessons are boring					

46.	You prefer learning other subjects to history					
47.	Learning history demands a lot of efforts than other subjects.					
48.	History learning is all about memorization of facts					
49.	Studying history is about learning past things					
50.	History learning is about listening to the teacher as he/she teaches					
51.	History learning calls for the evaluation of evidences/records					
52.	Studying history calls for critical thinking					
53.	Studying history requires the application of knowledge					
54.	History learning requires the determination of similarities and					

	differences in historical facts					
--	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

55. Please tick [√] the appropriate box to indicate the period(s) devoted to the teaching of history per week in your school.

1 period [ ]

2 periods [ ]

3 periods [ ]

4 periods [ ]

56. How would you rate the period(s) allocated for the teaching of history considering the topics to be covered in the syllabus?

Very Inadequate [ ] Inadequate [ ] Adequate [ ] Very Adequate [ ]

**APPENDIX E**

OBSERVATION GUIDE

SECTION A: Personal data of History teacher

Sex.....

Qualification.....

Teaching experience.....

Number of years of teaching History.....

SECTION B

Teaching and Learning Techniques for History

Discussion Method

Statement	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Regularly
1.The teacher promotes a friendly atmosphere for discussion				
2.The teacher writes the main question on the board before the discussion				
3.The teacher allows enough time for students to discuss through sharing and analysis of the question under consideration				
4.There is a uniform discussion or only a section of the class involved				
5.The teacher makes sure that each student participate in the discussion				
6.Teacher periodically puts students into small group				
7.Teacher occasionally assign role to students				
8.Teacher draws all students into the				



discussion				
9. Teacher tactfully correct wrong answers				

Question and Answer Method

10. The teacher asks the question before calling the student's name				
11. The teacher allows time for thinking				
12. The teacher ask one question at time				
13. The teacher collects several answers to a question, even if the first answer is a perfect response				
14. The teacher uses a variety of probing questions				
15. The teacher acknowledges students' responses				
16. The teacher builds on students' responses				
17. The teacher avoids 'Yes and No' responses				
18. The teacher distributes the questions evenly				
19. The teacher's questions are clear				
20. The teacher creates a congenial atmosphere for students to ask questions				

Lecture Method

21. The teacher provides aids to illustrate points				
--	--	--	--	--

22.The teacher provides examples to link the topic to the lives of the learners				
23.The teacher presents the topic logically, sequentially and systematically, by way of building upon previous content areas				
24.The teacher speaks loudly, clearly and uses simple language				

SECTION B

Use of Teaching-Learning Resources for History Teaching

Statement	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Regularly
26.The teacher reads the textbook without explaining				
27.The teacher ask students to read the textbook and then follows with questions				
28.The teacher uses the textbook as and when necessary				

Visual Materials (maps and charts)

29.The teacher uses the maps and charts at the appropriate time of the lesson				
30.The teacher is able to explain the details of the maps and charts				
31.The teacher is able to link the topic clearly to the map or chart being used				

32.The teacher invites the students to identify certain areas on the map of charts to the class				
---	--	--	--	--