

Historiography and Historical Methods

Professor Andrew Robertson et al.

Spring 2025

Course Description

Historiography is the study of the history and theory of historical writing. Students enrolled in this course will journey through American history guided by Professor Andrew Robertson and seven other professors (Zara Anishanslin, Ned Blackhawk, Kristopher Burrell, Sarah King, Lauren Santangelo, Nora Slonimsky, and Wendy Wall). Students will read and discuss historical interpretations of the American past as they have changed over time in specific chronological periods—colonial/Revolutionary history, the early nineteenth century to Reconstruction, the Gilded Age to the Cold War, and the 1960s to the present. This course will also present lectures on the evolving historiographies of African American history, Native American history, and women’s history by scholars specializing in those fields. The historical methods portion of the course will teach students to interrogate primary sources and to read secondary sources with a critical eye.

Course Readings

1. Cheng, Eileen Ka-May. *Historiography: An Introductory Guide*. New York: Continuum, 2012. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))
2. Maza, Sarah. *Thinking about History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.
3. Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 9th ed. Rev. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.
4. Readings by historians linked to Moodle modules.

Course Requirements

- Watch all course lectures
- Complete all course readings
- Contribute to ten discussion boards to demonstrate significant understanding of the issues of historiography and readings
- Complete five short papers (1–2 pages; 275–550 words exclusive of citations)
- Participate in at least three Q&As and answer a question about the topics discussed in the session for each
- Complete one of the following:
 - o A substantial project about a historiographical controversy including a short historiographical paper that demonstrates the same rigor as the final paper (5 pages or 1375 words exclusive of citations)

- o A historiographical paper that demonstrates a depth of research on a controversial topic in history and an understanding of the conversation among historians on that topic (15 pages; approximately 3750 words exclusive of citations)
- Complete a course evaluation (a survey link will be sent to your Gettysburg email during Week Eleven of the semester)

Learning Objectives

1. Students will evaluate the ways historians study the past by exploring analytical, theoretical, and methodological tools that historians employ and the schools of thought that justify the use of those tools.
2. Students will assess the strengths and weaknesses of these tools of history and analyze them through written exercises.
3. Students will create a project/paper demonstrating an understanding of debates about the study of history and how those debates have shifted over time.

Class Schedule

Week One: February 6: Introduction to History and Historiography

This week, in the readings, lecture, and discussion forum, we will review the difference between history and historiography and reflect on the importance of historiographical analysis and debate in American history.

Readings

- Maza, *Thinking about History*, Introduction
- Aaron Astor, "Slavery Historiography, Overview of Contemporaries and Historians" in Aaron Astor and Thomas C. Buchanan, eds., *Slavery: Interpreting American History* (Ashland: The Kent State University Press, 2021). ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))
- Benjamin Madley, "Reexamining the American Genocide Debate: Meaning, Historiography, and New Methods," *American Historical Review* 120, no. 1 (2015): 98–139. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))

Lecture

- Professor Andrew Robertson, "Introduction to History and Historiography"

Assignments

- Week One Discussion Board due Sunday, February 9
 - Prompt: In a discussion post of approximately 300 words, respond to the following three prompts:
 - Introduce yourself! Where are you located? What do you teach? Please include anything interesting you would like to share about yourself with the cohort.
 - Share something from Maza's Introduction that struck you as an "aha!" moment or, something new that you had never before considered about the study of history, or what history is.
 - Reflect on the historiography articles by Aaron Astor, "Slavery Historiography, Overview of Contemporaries and Historians" and Ben Madley, "Reexamining the American Genocide Debate: Meaning, Historiography, and New Methods." For each article, share what you discerned was the debate (or debates) that historians engage in on each topic. Why are these debates, and the scholarship that is produced from them, important to American history? How have these debates shaped the way these particular histories are written?
 - Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, February 12.
-

Week Two: February 13: Historical Methodology: Primary Sources

This week the focus is on methodology: how historians do what they do. Importantly, historians must work with primary sources to do research and craft their arguments and narratives. This week, the readings, lecture, and assignments all address how historians use primary sources in their work. You will propose how to apply this information to a primary source you identify.

Readings

- Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers*, Chapters 1–4.
- W. H. McDowell, *Historical Research: A Guide to Writers of Dissertations, Theses, and Books* (England: Routledge, 2002), Chapters 5 and 8. (A link to this reading can be found in the Week Two module.)

Lecture

- Professor Andrew Robertson, "Historical Methodology: Primary Sources"

Assignments

- Week Two Discussion Board due Sunday, February 16
 - Prompt: In a post of approximately 250 words, please share how you understand the difference between primary and secondary and tertiary sources and share one example of how you have used each of these types of sources either in your teaching or research, or both.

- Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, February 19
 - Short Paper One due Wednesday, February 19
 - Prompt: Reflect on Professor Robertson's lecture as well as the assigned reading in Turabian and McDowell.
 - Respond to the following in a short essay of one to two pages, 275–550 words: Choose one of the types of primary sources described by McDowell in Chapter 5 and find one online example of that type of source. Based on what you have learned this week, describe how you might work with this source.
-

Week Three: February 20: Historical Methodology: Secondary Sources

This week the focus is twofold. You will be reading about the "history of history" in Eileen Ka-May Cheng, *Historiography: An Introductory Guide*. You will also learn about and apply historical methods in using secondary sources in Professor Robertson's lecture and Marc Trachtenberg, *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Secondary sources include historical monographs (books) and journal articles, and these are sources you will deeply engage with in this course as you work on historiographical papers.

Readings

- Cheng, *Historiography*, Introduction and Chapters 1–6.
- Marc Trachtenberg, *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), Chapter 3. (A link to this reading can be found in the Week Three module.)

Lecture

- Professor Andrew Robertson, "Historical Methodology: Secondary Sources"

Assignments

- Week Three Discussion Board due Sunday, February 23
 - Prompt: This discussion forum has two distinct prompts. One asks about secondary sources and methodology; the other about the various historiographical movements you read about in Cheng. In a post of approximately 250 words, refer to Professor Robertson's lecture and the readings this week to support your post.
 - Find one secondary source you've never used before on the topic of your final paper. Cite the source, describe how you found it, and how you located the thesis of it. Describe how you might use one or two of the methodologies you learned about this week when you work with this source.
 - Briefly compare and contrast two of the historical/historiographical movements described in the Cheng reading. What do you think is the value of each? Any drawbacks?

- Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, February 26
 - Final Project/Paper Question due: Wednesday, February 26
 - In roughly 1–2 pages (275–550 words exclusive of citations) briefly describe the topic of your final historiographical paper or project. This should include a description of the paper or project you are proposing, some background information and historical context on your topic, and an explanation for why your particular paper or project might make a worthwhile contribution to understanding the field you are researching.
-

Week Four: February 27: The History of American Historiography

This week, we will begin to focus on American historiography, and one of the major historiographical debates in American historiography: when and how was this nation founded? We will read about the 1619 Project, and the various reactions to it from historians, as well as an important theory that underlies much of this debate, Critical Race Theory. This will be the focus of the discussion forum and the short paper this week.

Readings

- Nikole Hannah-Jones, "The 1619 Project," *New York Times Magazine*, August 14, 2019. ([A link to this reading can be found in the Week Four module.](#))
 - [Instructions for accessing the New York Times free through Gettysburg College.](#)
- Victoria Bynum et al. Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, December 29, 2019. ([A link to this reading can be found in the Week Four module.](#))
- David Waldstreicher, "The Hidden Stakes of the 1619 Controversy," *Boston Review*, January 24, 2020. ([A link to this reading can be found in the Week Four module.](#))
- Kimberle Crenshaw, "Twenty Years of Critical Race Theory," *Connecticut Law Review* 43, no. 5, July 2011. ([A link to this reading can be found in the Week Four module.](#))

Lecture

- Professor Andrew Robertson, "The History of American Historiography"

Assignments

- Week Four Discussion Board due Sunday, March 2
 - Prompt: In a post of approximately 250 words, refer to the lecture and readings this week to respond to the following questions:
 - How would you describe the controversy engendered by the *New York Times's* "The 1619 Project"? What biases or background do you think the authors bring to this controversy? What is the difference between "bias" and background"? How is Critical Race Theory a part of this debate?
 - Use and cite quotations from the readings to document your argument.

- Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, March 5.
 - Short Paper Two due: Wednesday, March 5
 - Prompt: Respond to the following in a short essay of 1–2 pages (275–550 words):
 - What argument is Nikole Hannah-Jones making in the 1619 Project and how does that reflect Critical Race Theory?
 - Be sure to cite the readings to support the points you make in your essay.
-

Week Five: March 6: Place, Ideas, Objects

This week, we will learn about historical approaches focusing on people, place, ideas, and objects. This week we will also continue to work on your historiographical paper by revising your initial proposal and creating an annotated bibliography.

Readings

- Maza, Chapters 1, 2, and 3.
- Turabian, Chapters 15, 16, and 17 (on citation and bibliography).

Lecture

- Dr. Zara Anishanslin, “The Historiography of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries”

Assignments

- Week Five Discussion Board due Sunday, March 9
 - In this discussion forum, reflect on the differences between the histories of who, where, and what, according to the Maza reading. What approach is most appealing to you? Share one secondary source you are working with that falls into one of these categories and explain why you think it should be in that category. What about the source indicates the kind of history it is? Do you see yourself as a historian that takes one of these approaches over the others? Share your inspiration for that.
 - Use and cite quotations from the readings in your post.
 - Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, March 12
- Revised Question and Proposed Bibliography due Wednesday, March 12
 - In roughly 1–2 pages (275–550 words exclusive of citations) revise your initial proposal to incorporate your section professor’s feedback AND

- Create an annotated bibliography containing at least five sources. Each of these sources should be followed by a paragraph (100–150 words exclusive of citations) describing the author’s credentials, the author’s work, and what this source will contribute to your final paper/project.
-

Week Six: March 13: The Historiography of the Nineteenth Century and Power

This week, the readings, lecture, and assignments engage the historiography of the nineteenth century. As you read the essays and listen to the lecture, you will evaluate how historians have written about this century, and how that writing has changed over time. The power of governments, peoples, and ideologies—and the resistance to dominant power—permeates all of history, including the history of nineteenth-century America. It also informs the production of history. You will apply your learning by describing how the theme of power plays into this history and historiography.

Readings

- Daniel Feller, “The Historical Presidency: Andrew Jackson in the Age of Trump,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 51, no. 3, 9/21: 667–681. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))
- Michel Foucault, “Truth and Power,” *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 51–75. ([A link to this reading can be found in the Week Six module.](#))

Lecture

- Dr. Nora Slonimsky, “The Nineteenth Century”

Assignments

- Week Six Discussion Board due: Sunday, March 16
 - Prompt: In a post of approximately 250 words, reflect on one of the major themes of Dr. Nora Slominsky’s lecture on nineteenth-century historiography: power, and connect this with the Foucault reading.
 - Using what you have learned this week about how historians address issues of power, describe the theme of power in at least one of the works you are using in your final paper/project and explain how your readings this week help you understand that theme. Be sure to use quotations from the readings and the work you choose to illustrate your points.
 - Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, March 19.
- Short Paper Three due: Wednesday, March 19
 - Prompt: Reflect on one of the readings you have read during this course and provide an overview of their analysis of the historiography it describes.
 - Respond to the following questions in a short essay of 1–2 pages (275–550 words):

- What major turning points and shifts in analysis does the author you chose trace in the historiography of their topic?
 - What accounts for the shifts in the interpretations of historians on this topic, according to what you've read?
 - Describe a shift in the historiography of the topic you are researching for your final paper/project. Do you see any similarities between the historiography of your topic and the assigned works you have read thus far in this course?
-

Week Seven: March 20: Gilded Age through the New Deal

This week the focus is on the historiography of the Gilded Age, Progressive Era, and the Interwar Wars. The readings and lecture share many of the significant works that address this period in American history. You will apply your learning this week by researching an important work on one of these eras. You will also evaluate a book review—one of the best ways to learn about scholarship and get a sense of the historiography of a certain period or topic.

Readings

- Richard Hofstadter, "Conflict and Consensus in American History," in *The Progressive Historians* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1968), Chapter 12. (A link to this reading can be found in the Week Seven module.)
- Sarah A Whitt, "'An Ordinary Case of Discipline': Deputizing White Americans and Punishing Indian Men at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1900–1918," *Western Historical Quarterly* 54, no. 1, Spring 2023: 51–70. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))

Lecture

- Dr. Wendy Wall, "Gilded Age through the New Deal"

Assignments

- Week Seven Discussion Board due: Sunday, March 23
 - Prompt: In a post of approximately 250 words, refer to both the lecture by Dr. Wall and the readings assigned this week.
 - What argument is Hofstadter making? What argument is Sarah A. Whitt making? Reflect on how the time these historians wrote these publications might influence their analysis and writing. Which do you find more compelling, and why?
 - Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, March 26.
- Short Paper Four due: Wednesday, March 26

- One of the things that scholars do is write book reviews that give not only a critical assessment of a historical monograph (book), but also an overview of it: what sources are used, what arguments are made, and how the work is situated in the historiography. One of the skills one needs to learn in graduate school is twofold: how to write a book review essay and how to read one to get a sense of a book you simply do not have time to read.
 - Prompt: Respond to the following instructions in a short essay of 1–2 pages (275–550 words):
 - Identify a monograph you want to read. It might be a work in your bibliography for your final paper, one your section professor has recommended, or one that has been mentioned in the lectures that intrigues you.
 - Find a book review of it in a scholarly journal and, in this short paper, provide an “overview of the review.” What does the reviewer say are the arguments of the book, the contributions of the book, the shortcomings, and importantly, how it is situated in the historiography? Every good review should tell you these things.
-

Week Eight: March 27: The Twentieth Century: Post-WWII

This week we will engage two themes: the historiography of the twentieth century, and a methodological and historiographical discussion of how history is made. You will also write the first five pages (1375 words exclusive of citations) of your historiographical paper for review by your section professor and your peers. There is no discussion this week, but you will post your preview to next week’s discussion board.

Readings

- Maza, Chapter 4.
- Richard Overy, "Prologue," *Blood and Ruins: The Last Imperial War, 1931–1945* (New York: Viking Press, 2022), 2–28. (A link to this reading can be found in the Week Eight module.)

Lecture

- Dr. Sarah King, “The Twentieth Century: Post-WWII”

Assignments

- Project/Paper Preview due: Wednesday, April 2
 - In roughly 5 pages (1375 words exclusive of citations), prepare your first rough draft.

- Final Project: Submissions of the project preview will differ from project to project according to type. Determine an appropriate portion of your final project to turn in with your section professor.
 - Paper Preview: Upload a copy of your draft to a discussion board for next week to share with your peers. Include a title page with a real title, all the appropriate footnotes, and a bibliography of at least ten sources.
-

Week Nine: April 3: Historiography of Women's History

This week the focus is on the historiography of women's and gender history. While this field has been around for a while, it continues to evolve into ever more complex ideas about gender and identity, influencing the interpretations of all historical topics and time periods, as Aaron Astor's reading on slavery historiography in Week Ten will discuss. You will apply your learning by comparing women's history and gender history, and you will write a review of a preview posted by one of your colleagues to the discussion board.

Readings

- Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1053–1075. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))
- Cornelia Dayton and Lisa Levenstein, "The Big Tent of U.S. Women's and Gender History," *Journal of American History* 99, no. 3 (December 2012): 793–817. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))

Lecture

- Dr. Lauren Santangelo, "Historiography of Women's History"

Assignments

- Week Nine Discussion Board due: Sunday, April 6 (You should have posted your Preview to this discussion board last week.)
 - Prompt: Choose the Preview of another student and write them a short note by Thursday saying you will review it. When you choose someone to review, try to make sure it is someone whom no one else has chosen.
 - By Sunday, write 1–2 paragraphs (200–500 words exclusive of citations) of helpful suggestions to your correspondent. Consider the following:
 - Offer ways your peer could improve the paper, perhaps by clarifying a section or adding a good source you know about.
 - Ask at least two questions for your peer to think about.
 - Make sure your comments are directed to the paper and are not personal. This video gives some helpful tips on how to do a peer review. (A link to this video can be found in the Week Nine module.)

Answering your peer's questions is optional but take them seriously—this exercise is designed to help each of you by sharing work and ideas.

You will be graded only on the quality of your review of your peer's work—you are not graded on your Preview (that already got a grade!).

- Short Paper Five due: Wednesday, April 9
 - One of the skills scholars of history must master is to take complex information and distill it into something we can explain to our students and the public.
 - Prompt: Reflect on your readings, Dr. Santangelo's lecture, and the definitions of women's and gender history and respond to the following in a short essay of 1–2 pages (275–550 words):
 - Imagine you have to teach a basic overview of what women's and gender history is to your students or to a group of people not familiar with women's and gender history. How would you explain it and its importance?
 - Please reference the ideas and information provided in all of the assigned readings and the lecture in this module.
-

Week Ten: April 10: Historiography of African American History

This week the focus is on African American historiography and the issue of causality in history. You will also be turning in your rough drafts, and the assigned chapters in Turabian will help you in that effort.

Readings

- Maza, Chapter 5.
- Turabian, Chapters 6, 7, and 9 (on drafting).

Lecture

- Dr. Kristopher Burrell, "African American Historiography"

Assignments

- Week Ten Discussion Board due: Sunday, April 13
 - Prompt: In a post of approximately 250 words, refer to both the lecture by Dr. Burrell and any of the readings assigned throughout this course.
 - How does Dr. Burrell describe the major turning points of African American historiography, and what connections to previous reading from this semester did you make while listening to his lecture?
 - Make sure you respond substantively to at least two other students no later than Wednesday, April 16.

- Rough Draft due: Wednesday, April 16
 - Final Project: Submissions of the rough draft will differ from project to project according to type. Determine an appropriate portion of your final project to turn in with your section professor.
 - Paper: In a minimum of 10 pages (2750 words exclusive of citations), prepare your second rough draft by building on the five pages of your preview draft.
-

Week Eleven: April 17: Historiography of American Indian History

The focus this week is on Native American history and historiography, as well as contemplation of major theoretical innovations that challenged the history profession, such as postmodernism. You will apply your learning to evaluate the historiography of a tribe or nation of your choice.

Readings

- Maza, Chapter 6.
- Ned Blackhawk, "Recasting the Narrative of America: The Rewards and Challenges of Teaching American Indian History," *Journal of American History* 93, no. 4 (March 2007): 1165–1170. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))

Lecture

- Dr. Ned Blackhawk, "Historiography of American Indian History"

Assignments

- Week Eleven Discussion Board due: Sunday, April 20
 - Prompt: In a post of approximately 250 words, refer to both the lecture by Dr. Blackhawk and the readings assigned this week.
 - Choose a tribe or nation (perhaps one native to your state or hometown) and do a little research. Answer these questions:
 - In your experience, are there any popular misconceptions about that tribe?
 - What kind of historiography do you find on that tribe?
 - What gaps remain, do you think, in our understanding of this tribe?
-

Week Twelve: April 24: The Future of History

This week we are preparing your final drafts and thinking about the future of history.

Readings

- Lara Putnam, "The Transnational and the Text-Searchable: Digitized Sources and the Shadows They Cast," *American Historical Review* 121, no. 2 (April 2016): 377–402. ([This reading can be accessed through Musselman Library with your Gettysburg College credentials.](#))
- Maza, Conclusion.

Lecture

- Dr. Andrew Robertson, "The Future of History"

Assignments

- Final Project/Paper due: Wednesday, April 30

Course and Program Policies

It is the responsibility of students to know, understand, and abide by course and program policies.

For a full overview of program policies, review the Gettysburg College–Gilder Lehrman Institute Student Handbook.

Course correspondence

Correspondence with faculty and administrators should be formal. Include a subject line, addressee, and closing. Put the name and number of your course in the subject line.

Plagiarism and AI

This program uses Turnitin to check for instances of plagiarism and AI. Plagiarism and papers composed fully or in part by AI will not be tolerated. This includes self-plagiarism. A student caught plagiarizing or composing papers with AI for the first time may receive a zero on the assignment. A student caught plagiarizing or composing with AI for a second time may be permanently removed from the program.

Your section professor will set the policies for use of AI for research or purposes other than composing your papers.

Late work

Assignments should be submitted no later than 11:59 p.m. Pacific Time on the due date unless otherwise specified by your section professor. If you think you will be unable to submit an assignment on time, it is your responsibility to contact your section professor to ask for an extension before the assignment's due date. Late assignments will be docked 5%

if less than a week late, 10% if one week late, and an additional 10% for each subsequent week.

Grading scale

Letter Grade	Number Grade	Grade Points
A	95%–100%	4
A-	90%–94%	3.67
B+	87%–89%	3.33
B	84%–86%	3
B-	80%–83%	2.67
C+	77%–79%	2.33
C	74%–76%	2
C-	70%–73%	1.67
D+	67%–69%	1.33
D	64%–66%	1
D-	60%–63%	.67
F	0%–59%	0

Assignment Descriptions

Short Papers (25%of grade)

Throughout each term students will complete five short papers. Each of these assignments should be 500 words in length, in 12 pt. font, and double-spaced. Students should respond thoughtfully to the prompt, citing readings and lectures as appropriate.

Discussion Board Posts (18% of grade)

Students will respond to nine virtual discussion board posts for each course. Discussion boards are led by your section professor, who will provide an analytical prompt related to course material and instructions for participation. These prompts will give you the opportunity to interact with your fellow students and share your interpretation of course themes.

Question-and-Answer Sessions (15% of grade)

Eight question and answer sessions will be held during the semester in the Lecture Section of this course. The second and last are led by Professor Andrew Robertson. The other six are led by Professor Jennifer Seman. Attendance for the first Q&A is **highly recommended** as it will cover key ideas for this course that will help you succeed.

Students MUST attend at least three of these eight sessions. NOTE: In order to receive participation credit for attending Q&As, you must complete a 1-2 paragraph reaction assignment within 24 hours of participation. Students who can not attend at least three sessions will have the opportunity to complete makeup reactions based on archived Q&As to receive full Q&A participation credit. Q&A recordings are available in the lecture section of this course. **Makeup reactions should be roughly 500 words and must be completed within one week of the Q&A.**

Final Paper/Project (42% of grade)

For the final assignment of the term, you will choose to complete a 15-page historiographical essay or project. This paper/project should critically examine how American historians have interpreted the same event differently and why shifts in historical debates may have occurred. Sample projects include (but are not limited to) vodcasts, documentary editing and transcription, podcasts, websites, annotated readers, walking tours, or museum exhibits. Lesson plans *will not* be accepted. A 5-page paper narrative must accompany the project. Your section professor must approve historiographical projects.

Regardless of whether you choose to pursue a paper or project, the full papers or projects are broken down into smaller assignments, or scaffolded, throughout the semester. This method breaks up a large grade into smaller constituent grades and allows students time to incorporate instructor feedback into their assignment.

Scaffolded Assignments

- Final Paper/Project Proposal (2%):

In roughly 1–2 pages, outline the topic of your final historiographical paper or project. This should include a description of the paper or project you are proposing, some background information on and historical context for your topic (answer the questions who, what, where, and when), and a justification for why your particular project or paper is worth pursuing (What is the significance of this topic's historiography? What do you propose can be learned from an analysis of the shifts in this historiography?)

- Revised Proposal and Annotated Bibliography (3.5%):

This assignment will give you the opportunity to incorporate the feedback you received on the first draft of your proposal. In addition to incorporating your section professor's comments, you will also submit a proposed bibliography listing five sources you plan to

use in your historiographical paper or project. Each of these sources should be followed by a brief summary (3–5 sentences) of the source and how it factors into the historiographical evolution of your topic.

- Paper or Project Preview (5%):

This will give you the opportunity to show the progress you have made on your final project or paper and get some early-stage feedback from your section leader. For a final paper, this should be roughly the first five pages of what will ultimately be your final submission. For a final project, determine with your section professor an appropriate portion of your final submission to turn in.

- Rough Draft (10.5%):

For a final paper, this should be, at minimum, the first ten pages of what will ultimately be your final submission. For a final project, determine with your section professor an appropriate portion of your final submission to turn in.

- Final Product (21%):

Final Paper: Final papers should be at least fifteen pages in length.

Final Project: Much like the final paper option, a final project is meant to prove that you have mastered the content covered by this course. We encourage you to be creative in your approach to this project, though it should be equivalent in rigor and workload to a final paper.