# Rubrics for Examining Historical Thinking Skills in High School World History Activities and Student Work: Construct Validity Evidence from the Literature

Angela Hardy and Emi Iwatani

January 10, 2021

## Suggested Citation

Hardy, A. & Iwatani, E. (2021). *Rubrics for examining historical thinking skills in high school world history activities and student work: Construct validity evidence from the literature.* Digital Promise.

## Acknowledgements

This research was made possible through funding by Gates Ventures. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funders.

## Contact Information

Email: ahardy@digitalpromise.org

Digital Promise Global:
**Washington, DC**:
1001 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 935
Washington, DC 20036

**San Mateo, CA:**
2955 Campus Dr. Suite 110
San Mateo, CA 94403

Website: https://digitalpromise.org/

## Executive Summary

Digital Promise sought to develop two sets of historical thinking skills rubrics for use in its evaluation of Gates Ventures' World History Project (WHP) curriculum: the first to evaluate the potential of teacher-assigned activities (e.g., an essay prompt) to provide opportunities for students to learn historical thinking skills, and the second to assess the extent to which students successfully used historical thinking skills in the work these activities produced (e.g., a written essay). We adopted a principled assessment development approach called *evidence-centered design* (Mislevy et al., 2003), beginning with a thorough literature review. To help articulate the domain and the types of claims we wanted to make, we researched how historical thinking skills have been conceptualized by academics and applied to standards, curricula, and assessments used by practitioners. In order to define our assessment targets, we compared cognitive models of historical thinking and then identified convergences in dimensions of historical thinking used in widely-recognized national frameworks and standards. Finally, to specify the evidence we would need to observe to be able to infer that the targets were met, we considered empirical evidence on the progression of historical thinking skills. Insights from the literature allowed us to explicitly define six concrete historical thinking skills (called "dimensions") for inclusion in our rubrics (e.g., causation, sourcing), and then draft descriptions for ratings between 0 and 3 (called "progressions" or "scores") for each skill, depending on the level of the activity or student work along that dimension.

Background and overview about the rubric development process, the rubrics themselves and some initial validity evidence can be found in Iwatani et al. (2021). In this paper, we elaborate on how the literature on history education and historical thinking skills informed rubric design, including details of what it says about:

- How historical thinking skills have been defined in the literature.
- An overview of the dimensions of historical thinking used in national frameworks and standards.
- Convergences of concepts across multiple frameworks and standards.
- Evidence on the progression of historical thinking skills.

# Introduction: How have historical thinking skills been conceptualized in the literature?

## What is historical thinking?

Over the past few decades, the paradigm of teaching history has shifted. Rather than seeing history as primarily a narrative with facts for students to memorize and recall, history education scholars and practitioners now commonly distinguish historical content knowledge (facts about e.g., historical periods, themes, regions, people, and events) from the knowledge of how to "do" history by engaging in disciplinary practices such as interpreting historical texts (Keirn, 2018; Lévesque & Clark, 2018). As such, the development of historical thinking skills, or skills to "do" history, is an explicit goal of the World History Project (WHP) curriculum, in alignment with widely recognized U.S. frameworks and standards such as the C3 Framework for Social Studies (2013) and Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies (2010), as well as assessments such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) (NAGB, 2013). Following conceptualizations employed in these frameworks, standards, and assessments, and aligned with American scholarship in history education (National Research Council, 2005; Seixas & Ercikan, 2015; Reisman, 2015; Korber & Meyer-Hamme, 2015), we define historical thinking as the skills that students employ when they analyze and apply historical content knowledge to interpret the past (e.g., make historical arguments, identify patterns over time, establish relationships of cause-and-effect). While reading and writing literacy skills are central to the demonstration of historical thinking skills (and indeed, literacy strategies with primary sources are often used as a proxy for historical thinking in standardized testing), for reasons explained below, we did not include literacy skills as part of our rubrics (Seixas & Ercikan, 2015; Reisman, 2015).

## What models of historical thinking exist in the literature? How have these models influenced standards, curriculum, and assessment?

Although there is an agreement in historical education literature that the study of history encompasses more than mere content knowledge, cognitive models defining the skills that constitute historical thinking vary (Lee, 2005). Early English scholarship on cognition models of historical thinking began with the London Institute of Education and the British Schools Council History Project (SCHP), as well as the Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches 7-14 (CHATA) projects conducted in the 1970s and 80s. English researchers established the concept of "second-order historical thinking concepts" and developed progressions of learning which were then used to guide national curriculum and pedagogical development (Lévesque & Clark, 2018; Seixas & Ercikan, 2015). In the same era, scholars in Germany and continental Europe developed competing models. Unlike the English model which focused on subject matter coupled with procedural concepts, German cognition models tended to focus on a more integrative philosophical concept of "historical consciousness", which connects interpretation of the past with insights into the present and expectations of the future. This strand of research has primarily been theoretical with few studies applying concepts to curriculum or assessment.

By the 1990s, two dominant (and often overlapping) streams of American research on historical thinking emerged (Keirn, 2018). Following the tradition of the Amherst Project which investigated historical reading from 1960 to 1972 (Seixas, 2017), Wineburg (2001) developed heuristics of historical thinking literacy (three types of reasoning involved in evaluating and using historical sources: contextualization, sourcing, and corroborating), while researchers who focused on conceptualizations of history as democratic citizenship education developed "cultural tools" for "doing history" that would help students better participate in civic life (Barton & Levstik, 2004). In the United States, research on historical thinking skills influenced the National Standards for History (1996) (although they were never adopted by Congress), the Advanced Placement World History Historical Thinking Skills (2019), the C3 Framework for Social Studies (2013), the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies (2010), and state history standards that address procedural knowledge in addition to content knowledge (Keirn, 2018). Influenced by both English and American developments, starting in the early 2000s Canadian researchers at the Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness and later through the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking project began developing a framework of six historical thinking concepts, which in turn influenced provincial and territorial curriculum and assessment (Lévesque & Clark, 2018; Seixas & Ercikan, 2015).

Dimensions of historical thinking skills (e.g., causation, analysis of change over time) and the descriptions of how they are interrelated are not uniform across the various cognition models that have emerged in English, German, America, and Canadian strands of research over the past several decades (Duquette, 2014; Seixas & Ercikan, 2015; Lévesque & Clark, 2018). For example, American models tend to emphasize historical reading skills (Wineburg, 2001; Reisman, 2015), while German and Canadian models might include a greater emphasis on a moral dimension of historical thinking (Peck & Seixas, 2008; Seixas, 2017). Indeed, even the terminology employed to refer to these skills (e.g., second-order concepts, procedural concepts, historical thinking skills, historical inquiry skills, historical reasoning skills) varies from model to model (van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018; Lévesque & Clark, 2018). Considering that our evaluation takes place in the United States, in developing our rubrics we drew from frameworks and standards developed from American strands of research and cognitive models. However, it is important to note that despite differences across various models, there is considerable convergence in the literature, with overlapping categories of historical thinking concepts appearing in the most commonly used national and international cognition models (Korber & Meyer-Hamme, 2015; Brookhart, 2015; Lévesque & Clark, 2018; van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018).

## Defining assessment targets: What dimensions of historical thinking skills are common across widely recognized national standards and frameworks? How do these align with the World History Project curriculum?

To ensure that our rubrics assessed valuable historical thinking skills, we started our process of defining assessment targets by investigating and comparing the dimensions of historical thinking skills defined by widely recognized U.S. frameworks and standards including the

National Council for the Social Studies in their C3 Framework for Social Studies (2013), the National Standards for History (1996), the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies (2010), and the Advanced Placement World History Historical Thinking Skills (2019). Next, we reviewed the categories of historical thinking skills defined by the WHP course guide (see Appendix 1).

Finally, we mapped the similarities between the historical thinking skills outlined in the WHP course guide and other national frameworks that have been influenced by the historical thinking movement (Keirn, 2018). Based on the significant overlap between the categories of historical thinking skills in WHP and skills described in the National Standards/Common Core, C3 Framework, and AP World History Framework (Appendix 2) as well as a consensus in history education literature that skills such as those emphasized in the WHP are common across multiple national and international cognition models of historical thinking (Korber & Meyer-Hamme, 2015; Brookhart, 2015; van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018), we felt confident moving forward with a subset of these WHP thinking skills[1] as the dimensions in our rubrics.

The WHP course guide explains that "all the historical thinking practices are critical and interconnected." This conceptualization of historical thinking skills (as overlapping with and building off one another) is not unique to the WHP course, and is broadly acknowledged in the history education literature (Lévesque & Clark, 2018). Educators may teach skills in isolation as they scaffold learning, but as activities become more complex over the course of the school year, they are likely to introduce assignments that demand students to engage multiple skills simultaneously. As a result, in scoring student work, the interdependence of historical thinking concepts can sometimes make it difficult to establish independent claims about individual skills (Seixas, Gibson & Ercikan, 2015), especially when these historical thinking skills significantly overlap with literacy skills (Reisman, 2017). For these reasons, and to better align with the way that other national frameworks conceptualize the role of reading and writing skills as they relate to historical thinking skills (i.e., that these literacy skills are embedded in the demonstration of historical thinking skills), we do not include reading or writing as distinct categories in our rubrics.

Drawing from agreements across frameworks mentioned above, we drafted brief descriptions for each of the selected historical thinking practices/skills: historical argumentation, causation, comparison, contextualization, continuity and change over time, and sourcing (see Table 1). We refer to the dimensions as practices when discussing opportunities to learn (i.e., teacher assignments), and skills when discussing their demonstration (i.e., student work).

[1] The WHP thinking skill of 'claim testing' was expanded into the dimension of 'historical argumentation' to better align both with the national frameworks reviewed and with changes in the beta version of the WHP curriculum. See Iwatani et al., 2021 for additional details on how this dimension evolved following the initial pilot.

**Table 1: Descriptions of selected historical thinking dimensions**

| Practice/Skill | The learning activity provides students the opportunity to: | Student work provides evidence that student: |
|---|---|---|
| Historical argumentation | Make and develop claims and/or assess the quality of claims found in historical accounts and/or interpretations | Made and developed claims and/or assessed the quality of claims found in historical accounts and/or interpretations |
| Causation | Employ causal reasoning | Employed causal reasoning |
| Comparison | Describe and explain similarities and differences between historical developments and processes, regions, eras, or other focal areas | Described and explained similarities and differences between historical developments and processes, regions, eras, or other focal areas |
| Contextualization | Contextualize historical phenomena and actions within a temporal, spacial and/or sociocultural setting | Contextualized historical phenomena and actions within a temporal, spacial and/or sociocultural setting |
| Continuity and Change Over Time | Analyze continuity and change over time | Analyzed continuity and change over time |
| Sourcing | Source a historical document (e.g., identify the author's purpose and perspective) | Sourced a historical document (e.g., identified the author's purpose and perspective) |

## What empirical evidence exists on progressions of skill development for various dimensions of historical thinking?

Once we identified dimensions as assessment targets, the next step in designing our rubrics was to build out descriptions of standards for each dimension at each level. In drafting our descriptions of the highest standard for each dimension (what we labeled as a "rigorous presence" of the historical thinking practice/skill), we drew from alignments in national frameworks of age appropriate expectations of secondary students (see Appendix B). Next, we

defined the lowest level as the absence of the historical thinking practice or skill. This lowest score would be applicable to a lesson that does not explicitly call for students to practice a particular historical thinking skill or an exemplar of student work where the student did not employ the relevant skill. Once these highest and lowest level descriptions were drafted, the next step was to develop research-informed progressions for each of the historical thinking dimensions between the highest and lowest levels.

Before they have developed historical thinking skills, research tells us that students approach their understanding of the past using common sense (National Research Council, 2005; Lee & Shemilt, 2003). For example, they may see the past through the lens of the present, believing that people in the past shared the same values and belief systems as contemporary humans, but were simply too stupid to make the 'right' choices (National Research Council, 2005; Lee, 2011; Wineburg, 2001).[2] Starting in the 1970s, then expanding in the 80s and 90s, in projects such as the Schools Council History Project History 13-16 and the Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches 7-14 (CHATA), British researchers developed taxonomies of how students move from common sense understandings such as 'presentism' to less intuitive thinking involving increasingly sophisticated applications of second-order concepts such as causation or change and development (Lee, 2011; Lévesque & Clark, 2018; Shemilt, 2018). Models developed by these researchers showed much agreement (Lee, 2011). As a result of these decades of empirical study, British researchers concluded that students do not naturally progress in historical understanding as they grow older, but do so because of targeted instruction that is designed to support progression (e.g., building on prior understanding, aligning assessment to second-order concepts) (Lee & Ashby, 2000). Students with a sophisticated understanding of one second-order concept might operate at a much simpler level of understanding with another concept, indicating that dimensions of historical thinking, although connected, are conceptually decoupled (Lee & Ashby, 2000). Finally, the progression models these researchers developed are considered valid for groups but not necessarily applicable to the learning path of individual students (Shemilt, 1979; 2018).

These findings from cognitive-oriented empirical history education research in Britain continue to provide the most in-depth longitudinal understanding of how students' historical thinking progresses over the years, but focus on the specific second-order concepts of evidence, empathetic explanation, causation, change and development, and historical accounts (Monte-Sano & Reisman, 2016). In more recent decades, researchers have continued to build on this work by exploring the ways that students progress in their thinking about other historical thinking concepts, with the majority of this research focused on how students work with historical sources (van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018). Of the remaining historical thinking dimensions we focus on in our rubrics, by far the most research to date has focused on causal reasoning, while research on the dimensions of contextualization and comparison remains quite thin (van Boxtel & van Drie, 2018).

[2] In our rubrics, we drew from this research on novice historical understanding to draft notes on several of the student work dimensions of possible student misconceptions a scorer might encounter.

To develop progressions of standards between the highest and lowest levels, we examined the types of changes that we would likely see as students progress in their historical thinking. Where possible, we drew from empirical studies that proposed progression models for historical thinking dimensions. This proved easier for some practices than others. We were able to locate research-based progression models for causation (National Research Council, 2005; Lee & Shemilt, 2009; Lee & Ashby, 2000), historical accounts (which informed the practice of claim testing) (Lee & Shemilt, 2004), and continuity and change over time (National Research Council, 2005; Blow, 2011). For historical concepts where the research on progression models was thin or non-existent, we looked to research from Project CHATA on how levels of cognitive operations progress for the strand of historical interpretation (beginning with knowledge, moving through hypothesis, analysis, and explanation, and ending with evaluation and judgement) to help inform distinctions between levels (Lee & Shemilt, 2003). In addition, we referred to empirical studies that addressed the teaching and learning of these historical thinking practices, looking to Wineburg (1991; 2001) to inform the practice of sourcing, Mumford (2015) to inform the practice of comparison, and Huijgen et al. (2018) to inform the practice of contextualization. At the end of this design phase, our rubrics included descriptions of four levels (0-3) for each dimension where 0 indicated the absence of a historical thinking practice/skill in the activity/student work, 1 indicated emergence, 2 indicated presence, and 3 indicated rigorous presence.

## Conclusion

An evidence-centered design approach guided our process of developing a set of rubric drafts that measured valuable historical thinking skills. Students' ability to employ historical thinking skills is a key objective of world history education by both scholars and practitioners, and an explicitly stated goal of the WHP curriculum. Thus, we set out to design a set of rubrics that could measure opportunities for students in U.S. high school world history classrooms to engage in historical thinking practices, and the extent to which students successfully used historical thinking skills in the work these opportunities produced. A thorough literature review on cognitive models of historical thinking and a comparison of dimensions of historical thinking used in leading U.S. history frameworks and standards supported our decision to include the assessment targets of historical argumentation, causation, comparison, contextualization, continuity and change over time, and sourcing. Drawing from empirical historical education research on progressions of skill development for the dimensions selected, we designed a set of four-point rubrics that articulated what a scorer would need to observe in a teacher activity or in student work to make an inference that the assessment target had been met. As a next step in our rubric development process, we piloted the draft rubrics (described in Iwatani, Means, Seylar & Hardy, 2021) by having expert world history teachers score a sample of world history assignments and associated student work and provide feedback on the rubrics and scoring process. Based on an analysis of rubric scores and scorer feedback, our team revised the draft rubrics to their final form (presented in Iwatani, Hardy, Means & Seylar, 2021).

## References


AP College Board. (2019). *World history: Modern course and exam description.* Retrieved March 11, 2020 from https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/ap-world-history/course

Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). A sociological perspective on history education. In *Teaching history for the common good* (pp. 1–24). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Blow, F. (2011). "Everything flows and nothing stays": How students make sense of the historical concepts of change, continuity and development. *Teaching History*, *145*, 47–55.

Brookhart, S. (2015). Commentary: Assessment of historical thinking in practice. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New directions in assessing historical thinking* (pp. 1–13). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Duquette, C. (2015). Relating historical consciousness to historical thinking through assessment. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New directions in assessing historical thinking* (pp. 1–13). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Huijgen, T., van de Grift, W., van Boxtel, C., & Holthuis, P. (2018). Promoting historical contextualization: the development and testing of a pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *50*(3), 410-434.

Iwatani, E., Hardy, A., Means, B., Seylar, J. (2021) *Rubrics for examining historical thinking skills in high school world history activities and student work*. Digital Promise.

Iwatani, E., Means, B., Seylar, J., and Hardy, A. (2021). *Rubrics on historical thinking skills for assignments and student work: Initial validity evidence.* Digital Promise.

Keirn, T. (2018). History Curriculum, Standards, and Assessment Policies and Politics: U.S. Experiences. In Metzger, S.A. & Harris, L.M. (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 119–148). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Korber, A. & Meyer-Hamme, J. (2015). Historical thinking, competencies, and their measurement: Challenges and approaches. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New directions in assessing historical thinking* (pp. 1–13). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Lee, P. (2005). Historical literacy: Theory and research. *History Education Research Journal*, *5*(1), 29–40.

Lee, P. (2011). Historical literacy and transformative history. In L. Perikleous, & D. Shemilt (Eds.). *The future of the past: Why history education matters* (pp. 129–167). Association for historical dialogue and research.

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

Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2003). A scaffold not a cage: Progression and progression models in history. *Teaching History*, 113, 13–24.

Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2004). "I just wish we could go back into the past and find out what really happened": Progression in understanding about historical accounts. *Teaching History,* 117, 25–31.

Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2009). Is any explanation better than none?: Over-determined narratives, senseless agencies and one-way-streets in students' learning about cause and consequence in history. *Teaching History,* 137, 42–49.

Lévesque, S., & Clark, P. (2018). Historical thinking: Definitions and educational applications. In S. A. Metzger & L. McArthur Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 119–148). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mislevy, R. J., Almond, R.G., & Lukas, J.F. (2003). *A brief introduction to evidence-centered design* (Research Report 03-16). Educational Testing Service.

Monte-Sano, C., & Reisman, A. (2016). Studying historical understanding. In L. Como & E. Anderman (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 281–294). Routledge.

Mumford, A. (2015). Parallels, prescience, and the past: Analogical reasoning and contemporary international politics. *International Politics*, *52*(1), 1–19.

Nash, G. M., Crabtree, C. A., & Taskforce, National Standards for History (1996). *National standards for history: basic edition*. Center for History in the Schools.

National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB). (2013). *U.S. history framework for the 2014 National Assessment of Educational Progress.*

National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). (2013). *The College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history.*

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/

National Research Council. (2005). *How students learn: History in the classroom*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/11100

Peck, C., & Seixas, P. (2008). Benchmarks of historical thinking: First steps. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *31*(4), 1015–1038.

Reisman, A. (2015). The difficulty of assessing disciplinary historical reading. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New directions in assessing historical thinking* (pp. 1–13). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Seixas, P. (2017). A model of historical thinking. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *49*(6), 593–605. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1101363

Seixas, P., & Ercikan, K. (2015). Introduction. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New directions in assessing historical thinking* (pp. 1–13). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Seixas, P., Gibson, L., Ercikan, K. (2015). A design process for assessing historical thinking. In K. Ercikan & P. Seixas (Eds.), *New directions in assessing historical thinking* (pp. 1–13). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Shemilt, D. (1979). The evaluation of Schools Council Project: History 13–16. Final report submitted to the History Committee of Schools Council. Held by the Council for Educational Technology following the dissolution of Schools Council.

Shemilt, D. (2018). Assessment of learning in history education: Past, present, and possible futures. In Metzger, S.A. & Harris, L.M. (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 119–148). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2018). Historical reasoning: Conceptualizations and educational applications. In S. A. Metzger & L. McArthur Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 119–148). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

World History Project. (2020). World History Project course guide. Retrieved March 30th, 2020 from https://whp.oerproject.com/Teacher-Resources

Wineburg, S. S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *28*(3), 495–519.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Temple University Press.

## Appendix 1: World History Project descriptions of "thinking practices"

| Thinking Practice | Definition |
|---|---|
| Reading | WHP seeks to improve students' ability to analyze, evaluate, and use a range of primary and secondary sources and video, including arguments about the past in a variety of formats or genres. Specifically, WHP activities regularly ask students to read sources deeply; to evaluate the roles that evidence, context, and underlying assumptions play in constructing an interpretation; and to evaluate the consequences or significance of one interpretation over another. |
| Writing | The WHP course is writing intensive. Students are asked to respond in writing to a variety of prompts, including those related to contextualization, causation, historical comparison, CCOT, and a variety of document-based questions (DBQs). |
| Claim testing[3] | Claim testing is an important analytical process for assessing the quality and veracity of claims. It helps students "see" and evaluate people's assertions and gives shape to a useful critical thinking practice in the study of history. Since history is all about making assertions, it's important that students learn the skill of testing claims early and use it frequently as part of evaluating historical accounts and making historical interpretations. |
| Causation | Causal reasoning can help students develop evidence-based explanations or arguments in response to causal questions that consider human actions, events, and larger structures or processes. |
| Comparison | Comparison is a key process that historians use to help them better understand the past. WHP seeks to improve student's ability to "do" historical comparison. WHP asks students to: Describe similarities and differences between different historical developments or processes; explain relevant similarities and differences between specific historical developments and processes; explain the relative historical significance of similarities and differences between different historical developments or processes. |
| Contextualization | A key component of historical inquiry is the ability to contextualize. Contextualization is a historical thinking skill that involves situating phenomena and actions by people in the context of time, space, and |

[3] In our rubric, this dimension is expanded to include opportunities for students to make or develop claims themselves, and is called 'historical argumentation'.

| | |
|---|---|
| | sociocultural setting. Context, in many ways, is complex and subtle, and involves other events, climate of opinion, and the local and more distant political, economic, social, and other cultural processes that surround the issue at hand. Contextualization is more than deciding when to begin an event. It requires students to think about the various layers of information that help us understand an event. Essentially, historical contextualization requires students to avoid "present-ism" – the tendency to interpret past events through the lens of modern values and concepts. |
| Continuity and Change Over Time (CCOT) | WHP seeks to improve students' capacity to evaluate historical continuity and change. Specifically, WHP lessons ask students to describe patterns of continuity and change over time; to periodize and explain patterns of continuity and change over time; to explain the relative historical significance of specific historical developments in relation to a larger pattern of continuity and change; to compare the past and the present to determine what has changed and what has remained stable; evaluate the degree to which change was global, interregional, regional, or local; assess different pace of change (slow, rapid); and determine the direction or impact of change (degree to which change or continuity was progressive or regressive). Learning how to evaluate continuity and change over time helps students make sense of historical processes and the evolution of those processes. |
| Sourcing | Sourcing—the act of understanding who wrote a document, where they wrote it, and why they wrote it, for the purposes of analysis or interpretation—is integral to the work of a historian. Without properly understanding an author's purpose and perspective, it's difficult to properly interpret a document. Therefore, students will learn how to discover how an author has framed an event, and how that then impacts their interpretation of it. The act of sourcing a historical event involves two of the essential practices that students have already been introduced to in this course: reading and claim testing. In order to adequately make sense of a historical account, students need to understand the author who is interpreting and then producing an account of that event. |

## Appendix 2: Comparison of categories of historical thinking in national frameworks

| World History Project | C3 Framework | National History Standards | AP World History | Common Core |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | Connections between Dimension 2 (applying disciplinary concepts and tools) and CCR Anchor Standards in the ELA/Literacy Common Core Standards: Anchor Reading Standards 1-10 made explicit in the framework (see Common Core column) | Embedded within other historical thinking dimensions (alignment with Common Core Standards provided as part of framework) | Embedded within other skills | RH 6-8.5: Describe how a text presents information (e.g., sequentially, comparatively, causally).<br>RH 6-8.2: Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of the source distinct from prior knowledge or opinions.<br><br>RH 11-12.2: Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary that makes clear the relationships among the key details and ideas. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | RH 9-10.9: Compare and contrast treatments of the same topic in several primary and secondary sources.<br><br>RH 9-10.6: Compare the point of view of two or more authors for how they treat the same or similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts.<br><br>RH 11-12.9: Integrate information from diverse sources, both primary and secondary, into a coherent understanding of an idea or event, noting discrepancies among sources. |
| Writing | Connections between Dimension 2 (applying disciplinary concepts and tools) and CCR | Embedded within other historical thinking dimensions (alignment with Common Core | Argumentation | ELA/Literacy Common Core Standards: Anchor Writing Standard 7: Conduct short as well as more |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anchor Standards in the ELA/Literacy Common Core Standards: Anchor Writing Standard 7 made explicit in the framework (see Common Core column) | Standards provided as part of framework) | | sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation. |
| Claim Testing | Dimension 2, Historical Sources and Evidence<br>• D2.His.10.9-12. Detect possible limitations in various kinds of historical evidence and differing secondary Interpretations.<br>• D2.His.13.9-12. Critique the appropriateness of the historical sources used in a secondary interpretation.<br><br>Dimension 3, Developing Claims and Using Evidence<br>• D3.2.9-12. Evaluate the credibility of a | Standard 4: Historical research capabilities;<br>• Interrogate historical data by uncovering the social, political, and economic context in which it was created; testing the data source for its credibility, authority, authenticity, internal consistency and completeness; and detecting and evaluating bias, distortion, and propaganda by omission, suppression, or invention of facts. | Practice 1: Analyzing Historical Evidence<br><br>Primary sources:<br>• Evaluate a source's credibility and/or limitations.<br><br>Secondary sources:<br>• Describe the claim or argument of a secondary source, as well as the evidence used.<br>• Explain how a historian's claim or argument is supported with evidence.<br>• Explain how a historian's context influences the claim or argument. | RH 11-12.8: Evaluate an author's premises, claims, and evidence by corroborating or challenging them with other information. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | source by examining how experts value the source.<br>• D3.3.9-12. Identify evidence that draws information directly and substantively from multiple sources to detect inconsistencies in evidence in order to revise or strengthen claims.<br>• D3.4.9-12. Refine claims and counterclaims attending to precision, significance, and knowledge conveyed through the claim while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both.<br><br>Dimension 3, Perspectives;<br>• D2.His.7.9-12. Explain how the perspectives of people in the present shape | | • Evaluate the effectiveness of a historical claim or argument. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | interpretations of the past.<br>• D2.His.8.9-12. Analyze how current interpretations of the past are limited by the extent to which available historical sources represent perspectives of people at the time. | | | |
| Causation | Dimension 2, Causation and Argumentation;<br><br>• D2.His.14.9-12. Analyze multiple and complex causes and effects of events in the past.<br>• D2.His.15.9-12. Distinguish between long-term causes and triggering events in developing a historical argument. | Standard 5: Historical issues-analysis and decision-making;<br>• Marshal evidence of antecedent circumstances and current factors contributing to contemporary problems and alternative courses of action.<br><br>Standard 3: Historical analysis and interpretation;<br>• Analyze cause-and-effect relationships bearing in mind | Historical Reasoning Skill: Causation<br><br>• Describe causes or effects of a specific historical development or process.<br>• Explain the relationship between causes and effects of a specific historical development or process.<br>• Explain the difference between primary and secondary causes and between short- and long-term effects. | RH 9-10.3: Analyze in detail a series of events described in a text; determine whether earlier events caused later ones or simply preceded them.<br><br>RI 5.5: Compare and contrast the overall structure (e.g., chronology, comparison, cause/effect, problem/solution) of events, ideas, concepts, or information in two or more texts.<br><br>RH 11-12.3: Evaluate various explanations for |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | multiple causation including (a) the importance of the individual in history; (b) the influence of ideas, human interests, and beliefs; and (c) the role of chance, the accidental and the irrational. | • Explain the relative historical significance of different causes and/or effects. | actions or events and determine which explanation best accords with textual evidence, acknowledging where the text leaves matters uncertain. |
| Comparison | C3 framework does not have a separate dimension for historical comparison (although dimensions within civics, economics and geography do call on students to make comparisons).<br><br>However, in Appendix D. Anthropology Companion Document for the C3 Framework, Concept 1. What It Means to be Human: Unity and Diversity refers to the | Standard 3: Historical analysis and interpretation;<br>• Compare and contrast differing sets of ideas, values, personalities, behaviors, and institutions by identifying likenesses and differences;<br>• Consider multiple perspectives of various peoples in the past by demonstrating their differing motives, beliefs, interests, hopes, and fears;<br>• Draw comparisons across eras and regions in order | Historical Reasoning Skill: Comparison<br><br>• Describe similarities and/or differences between different historical developments or processes.<br>• Explain relevant similarities and/or differences between specific historical developments and processes.<br>• Explain the relative historical significance of similarities and/or differences between different historical developments or processes. | RI 5.5: Compare and contrast the overall structure (e.g., chronology, comparison, cause/effect, problem/solution) of events, ideas, concepts, or information in two or more texts. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | anthropological relevance of comparison across place and time in the social studies, and states that College, Career, and Civic ready students:<br>• Develop through comparison awareness of human unity and cultural diversity, and of the connections among people from around the world. | to define enduring issues as well as large-scale or long-term developments that transcend regional and temporal boundaries. | | |
| Contextualization | Dimension 2, Change, Continuity, and Context;<br>• D2.His.1.9-12. Evaluate how historical events and developments were shaped by unique circumstances of time and place as well as broader historical contexts.<br>• D2.His.3.9-12. Use questions generated about | Standard 2: Historical comprehension;<br>• Appreciate historical perspectives (a) describing the past on its own terms, through the eyes and experiences of those who were there, as revealed through their literature, diaries, letters, debates, arts, artifacts, and the like; (b) considering the | Historical Reasoning Skill: Contextualization<br><br>• Describe an accurate historical context for a specific historical development or process.<br>• Explain how a relevant context influenced a specific historical development or process.<br>• Use context to explain | Not applicable |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | individuals and groups to assess how the significance of their actions changes over time and is shaped by the historical context.<br><br>Dimension 3, Perspectives;<br>• D2.His.5.9-12. Analyze how historical contexts shaped and continue to shape people's perspectives. | historical context in which the event unfolded–the values, outlook, options, and contingencies of that time and place; and (c) avoiding "present-mindedness," judging the past solely in terms of present-day norms and values. | the relative historical significance of a specific historical development or process. | |
| Continuity and Change over Time (CCOT) | Dimension 2, Change, Continuity and Context;<br>• D2.His.1.9-12. Evaluate how historical events and developments were shaped by unique circumstances of time and place as well as broader historical contexts.<br>• D2.His.2.9-12. Analyze | Standard 1: Chronological thinking;<br>• Reconstruct patterns of historical succession and duration in which historical developments have unfolded, and apply them to explain historical continuity and change.<br>• Establish temporal order in constructing their [students'] own historical | Historical Reasoning Skill: Continuity and Change over Time<br><br>• Describe patterns of continuity and/or change over time.<br>• Explain patterns of continuity and/or change over time.<br>• Explain the relative historical significance of specific historical developments in relation to a larger pattern of | RI 5.5: Compare and contrast the overall structure (e.g., chronology, comparison, cause/effect, problem/solution) of events, ideas, concepts, or information in two or more texts. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | change and continuity in historical eras.<br>• D2.His.3.9-12. Use questions generated about individuals and groups to assess how the significance of their actions changes over time and is shaped by the historical context. | narratives: working forward from some beginning through its development, to some end or outcome; working backward from some issue, problem, or event to explain its origins and its development over time. | continuity and/or change. | |
| Sourcing | Dimension 2, Perspectives;<br>• D2.His.4.9-12. Analyze complex and interacting factors that influenced the perspectives of people during different historical eras.<br>• D2.His.6.9-12. Analyze the ways in which the perspectives of those writing history shaped the history that they produced.<br><br>Dimension 3, Gathering and | Standard 2: Historical comprehension;<br>• Identify the author or source of the historical document or narrative; • Identify the central question(s) the historical narrative addresses and the purpose, perspective, or point of view from which it has been constructed. | Practice 1: Analyzing Historical Evidence<br><br>Primary sources:<br>• Explain how a source provides information about the broader historical setting within which it was created.<br>• Explain how a source's point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience might affect a source's meaning.<br>• Explain the relative historical significance of a | RH 9-10.1: Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.<br><br>RI 5.6: Analyze multiple accounts of the same event or topic, noting important similarities and differences in the point of view they represent.<br><br>RH 6-8.6: Identify aspects of a text that reveal an author's point of |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Evaluating Sources<br>• D2.His.11.9-12. Critique the usefulness of historical sources for a specific historical inquiry based on their maker, date, place of origin, intended audience, and purpose. | | source's point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience.<br>• Evaluate a source's credibility and/or limitations. | view or purpose (e.g., loaded language, inclusion or avoidance of particular facts).<br>RH 9-10.6: Compare the point of view of two or more authors for how they treat the same or similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts. |