Historical Empathy: A Literature Review

Duane Dunstan

EDCI- 598A- Project Proposal and Literature Review

Dr. Michelle Wiebe

December 10, 2018

Chapter 1- Introduction

Narrative of Interest

On August 11th, 2018, the statue of Canada's first Prime Minister, Sir John A. MacDonald, was removed from the front of City Hall in Victoria. As the statue was loaded onto a flatbed truck destined for storage, supporters chanted "White supremacy has to go!" as they held signs accusing the former Prime Minister of cultural genocide. The mayor of Victoria and the head of the City Family, Lisa Helps, asserted that this act is a necessary step in the difficult process of reconciliation (CBC News, Aug 11). Other local residents gathered to protest the removal by draping themselves in Canadian and British Columbian flags as they sang 'Oh Canada.'

While this controversial event captured my curiosity, I developed concern when students in my Social Studies 10 class, who attended the statue removal, described the flag wrapped protestors as "Neo-Nazis" (A. Hall, Sept 6, 2018). Obviously, devotees of Adolf Hitler and his National Socialist ideology have no connection to Sir John A. MacDonald and would, I presume, have little interest in keeping his statue in front of Victoria's City Hall. Rather, I believe the Social Studies students who viewed the protestors draped in Canadian flags as Neo-Nazis were placing contemporary values, concepts, language, and labels on a historical figure without a deep understanding of the context in which the figure lived. Whether or not the removal of the former Prime Minister's statue is a step toward reconciliation is debatable. What is not debatable, in my view, is that these students lack the historical knowledge and contextualization to put themselves in the historical figure's shoes in order to see the world as it was, and therefore to understand their actions in a historical perspective that differs from their own contemporary worldviews. As

a Social Studies educator, I propose the development of historical empathy as potentially an antidote to the challenge of presentism when considering historical events and figures.

Historical empathy strives to provide the context and perspective of how and why events happened as they did, rather than foist contemporary values and moral judgements upon the past (Brooks & Endacott, 2014; Yilmaz, 2007). The cultivation of historical empathy, particularly through simulation exercises, can bring history to life for learners with a richness that moves beyond the cerebral intellect to also include an affective impact that deepens learning and engagement (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Perrotta, 2018).

Significance to the B.C. Curriculum

In a broad perspective, the new BC curriculum intends to equip students with the skills and abilities that are most desirable in the economy of the 21st century. As stated in the Introduction to BC's Redesigned Curriculum (2015), British Columbia's educational system is being redesigned "to respond to (the) demanding world students are entering…to prepare students for the future, the curriculum must…(support) deep learning through concept-based and competency-driven approaches" (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/sites/curriculum.gov.bc.ca/files/pdf/curriculum_intro.pdf). Historical empathy can meet these broad curricular goals since it has concepts such as historical contextualization, affective engagement, and perspective taking at its heart (Brooks & Endacott, 2013; Endacott, 2014). Additionally, curricular competencies can be aligned with assessment standards and practices as educational planning takes place.

More narrowly, historical empathy connects to a number of curricular competencies in the new Social Studies curriculum. For starters, the competency that asks learners to "assess the significance of people, places, events, or developments, and compare varying perspectives on

their significance at particular times and places, and from group to group" (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/10/) speaks directly to the aforementioned goals of historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection (Brooks & Endacott, 2013; Endacott, 2014). Further, when learners are required to "assess how underlying conditions and the actions of individuals or groups influence events, decisions, or developments, and analyze multiple consequences," (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/10/) historical thinking contextualization can be employed to facilitate learners grappling with how the various conditions of the era shaped the views and actions of individuals or groups (Huijgen, van de Grift, van Boxtel, & Holthuis, 2018). Also, the curriculum encourages learners to "make reasoned ethical judgments about actions in the past and present, and assess appropriate ways to remember and respond" (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/10/). Historical empathy enhances learners' ability to meet this goal since they become aware of the pitfalls of presentism, egotistical drift, and misapplied moral judgements (Wineburg, 1999; Endacott, 2010; De Leur, van Boxtel, & Wilschut., 2017). Adopting historical empathy towards controversial figures to understand better their actions and motivations helps learners to make reasoned ethical judgments rather than judge those figures using the standards of the present (Seixas, 2017). Taken together, it is clear that the development of historical empathy exercises meets multiple curricular goals and competencies.

Social Studies 10 is now the last mandatory class that all learners take before selecting one more Social Studies course of interest at the grade 11 or 12 level. Social Studies 10 is therefore designed to provide a baseline level of knowledge of Canadian governance and 20th century history. For subject area educators, this presents an opportunity for all students to

develop historical empathy to achieve a deep understanding of history. Thus, Social Studies 10 is an ideal place to employ the practices of historical empathy.

Identification of Topics Examined

In the course of this literature review, I have examined a wide range of topics connected to historical empathy. The roots of historical empathy in the United States were uncovered through a number of implicit curricular objectives (Perrotta & Bohan, 2014) before being traced to the debates in the United Kingdom during the 1980s (Cunningham, 2009), then to the contemporary era in which historical empathy has become a primary goal of Social Studies education in Germany (Brauer, 2016), enjoyed increasing popularity in Finland (Rantala et al., 2016; Virta & Kouki, 2014), and a focus of research in the United States (Foster & Yeager, 1998; Brooks, 2008; Brooks, 2010; Endacott, 2008; Endacott, 2010; Endacott & Brooks, 2013). A survey of the various conceptions of historical empathy was conducted, which included the debate over definitions (Brauer, 2016), the connection to historical thinking (Seixas, 2017 ; Wineburg, 1999; Wineburg, 2006), the various goals and benefits (Brooks, 2008; Brooks, et al. 2014; Endacott, 2010; Huijgen et al., 2018), theoretical frameworks for pedagogical practice (Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Yilmaz, 2007), and assessment strategies (Brooks, 2008; Virta & Kouki, 2014). Finally, a narrow range of issues were examined such as the affective component of historical empathy (Endacott, 2010), the practical challenges of the classroom (Cunningham, 2009; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015), the benefits and drawbacks of first versus third-person writing (Brooks, 2008), challenges experienced by learners with disabilities (De La Paz & Wissinger, 2015), and a gap in historical empathy experienced by learners with diverse social identities (Perrotta, 2018).

Summary of Chapter 2

This literature review will consider, first, the concept of historical empathy with its competing and evolving definitions as well as its place under the umbrella of historical thinking. There is, then, an articulation of the goals and benefits of historical empathy, which is followed by a summary of principles and pedagogical practices currently in use. Next, the challenges of historical empathy development are examined, including the complexities of empathy itself, presentism, and egotistical drift. Finally, current gaps in the research are highlighted as specific attention is paid to diverse learners in the classroom, such as those with neurological disabilities and/ or multiple social identities.

Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter will outline a historical simulation of the FLQ crisis for use in Social Studies 10 classrooms in British Columbia. A rationale for the choice of the FLQ crisis is offered as is a rationale for the learning materials required for this simulation. Additionally, a series of questions is laid out that will assist educators moving through the introduction, investigation, display, and reflection phases. A discussion of assessment follows in which a framework for evaluation is established. Finally, a number of resources pertinent to the FLQ crises simulation is provided.

Chapter 2- Literature Review

Historical Empathy: an Evolving Definition

The curricular goal of historical empathy, stated more implicitly than explicitly, has roots stretching as far back in the U.S.A. as 1892 in the National Education Association (NEA)

Committee of Ten (Perrotta & Bohan, 2017). In 1896, the American Historical Association (AHA) established the Committee of Seven in order to implement the NEA Committee of Ten's work on Social Studies standards. Within two years, the AHA issued a report highlighting the "implicit curricular goal of historical empathy with its emphasis on student identification of the relationship between cause and effect from narratives in particular historical contexts" (Perrotta & Bohan, 2017, p.30). By 1922, there was further implicit evidence of historical empathy by the AHA with the recognition that "social studies education must involve student analysis of the contexts in which people develop perspectives on issues in order to understand rapid socio-economic and political changes taking place" (Perrotta & Bohan, 2017, p. 32). Yet, by 1938, John Dewey pushed back against the notions of identifying perspectives and making affective responses on historical content calling into question the ability of young minds to grasp this material and draw effective conclusions (Perrotta & Bohan, 2017).

Much of the groundwork for contemporary Social Studies researchers was laid by the American Rachel Davis DuBois from the 1940s to the 1980s. DuBois published multiple books advocating deeper understandings of diverse ranges of groups and peoples and their unique perspectives (Perrotta & Bohan, 2017). She lamented the lack of the cultivation of sympathy for the experience of others in American schools (Perrotta & Bohan, 2017). In her writings, DuBois tends to refer more to sympathy than empathy, yet this conflation is perhaps an issue of semantics as the goal of understanding the other through examination of context and perspective is at the heart of her work.

Educational research into historical empathy was also conducted in Great Britain in the 1970s and 80s (Cunningham, 2009). However, the debate failed to generate unified and accepted definitions as historical empathy was described as imagination, identification, intuition, a skill, a

power, a mode of inquiry, a heuristic process, an ability, an achievement, and a disposition (Cunningham, 2009).

In 1998, Foster and Yeager described historical empathy as an intellectual task of recreating historical perspectives using evidence, or “the ability to infer from given knowledge an explanation of certain actions” (p. 2). Lee and Ashby (2001) define historical empathy as “an activity in which students attempt to reconstruct, or form an image of, the decisions of an actor in the past, taking into consideration the context of the time in which these actors lived (as cited in De Leur et al., 2017, p. 332). Both of these definitions urge the learner to draw conclusions in light of the specific historical context of the era.

Building upon these broad definitions, other researchers pushed the conception of historical empathy further. In 2004, Barton and Levstik developed an equivalent called perspective recognition that contained five main criteria: a sense of otherness, shared normalcy, historical contextualization, multiplicity of historical perspectives, and contextualization of the present (as cited in Brooks, 2011). Yilmaz (2007) offered an equally robust description of historical empathy “as the ability to see and judge the past in its own terms by trying to understand the mentality, frames of reference, beliefs, values, intentions, and actions of historical agents using a variety of historical evidence” (p. 331). These visions of historical empathy are multi-layered, ask the learners to use historical evidence to contextualize the past, recognize that the beliefs and values of the past are not the same as today, and demonstrate understanding of a historical figures’ actions in light of the norms and influence of the era. Yet, despite the robustness of these conceptions, the affective dimension of this form of learning is not explicitly included in light of a greater focus on the cognitive domain.

In their seminal paper, *An Updated Theoretical and Practical Model for Promoting Historical Empathy*, Brooks and Endacott (2013) clarified both the definition of historical empathy and the pedagogical process for instruction. Attempting to move beyond an almost exclusive focus on the cognitive, Brooks and Endacott (2013) expanded the definition to include the affective domain. Historical empathy, they asserted, is a dual-dimensional construct that includes three interrelated concepts: historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. Additionally, their paper presented an instructional process in which four distinctive phases were developed to counter inconsistent pedagogical practices. These phases are: introduction, investigation, display, and reflection. Each phase has specific goals and foci that work in concert for students to develop deep understanding and engagement. Researchers in recent years have tended to use the definition provided Brooks and Endacott (2013) that articulates historical empathy as "the process of students' cognitive and affective engagement with historical figures to better understand and contextualize their lived experiences, decisions, or actions" (p. 41).

Historical Empathy & Historical Thinking

Historical empathy can be placed under the umbrella of historical thinking. Like historical empathy, the definition of historical thinking has not been easy to pin down. In his controversial essay titled *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts* (1999), Sam Wineburg claimed that historical thinking "is neither a natural process nor something that springs automatically from psychological development. Its achievement…actually goes against the grain of how we ordinarily think" (p. 491). If historical thinking goes against how people naturally think, as Wineburg claims, then two questions arise: (1) How do we normally think? (2) How is

historical thinking different? Wineburg (1999) anticipates these questions by recognizing, (1) that people's present values, beliefs, and ways of thinking are products of historical forces that are not easily set aside, and (2), that historical thinking attempts to prevent presentism, "the act of viewing the past through the lens of the present" (Wineburg, 1999, p. 496), by consciously trying to step outside these ways of thinking. This is a difficult task that is not accomplished in a night, but over time. Additionally, historical thinking is less about knowledge of the facts of history, although they are indispensable, and more about using history as a springboard to "stimulate new questions, to identify gaps in knowledge that prevent (learners) from understanding the fullness of the historical moment" (Wineburg, 2007, p. 11). Cast in this light, historical thinking is a way of "thinking and being" (Wineburg, 2006, p. 40) as opposed to the amassing of information. Above all, for Wineburg (2006), is the goal of removing the tendency toward simplistic thinking by recognizing the complexity that is present in the world and in historical events. If Wineburg is correct in his conceptualization of historical thinking, the practice of historical empathy can be seen as a means employed by the educator to enable learners to exercise historical thinking skills by learning context, recognizing the complexity inherent in any historical dilemma a figure faced, and becoming aware of the pitfall of presentism and how to avoid it.

Perhaps sparked by the provocative nature of Wineburg's work, other Social Studies educators further developed conceptions of historical thinking. Rantala, Manningen & van den Berg (2016) have argued that historical thinking includes the skills of investigation, use and evaluation of primary and secondary sources, cause and consequence analysis, and understanding change and continuity. Each one of these historical thinking skills can be practiced using historical empathy simulations since learners work to investigate cause, evaluate multiple

pieces of source material, and grapple with how certain choices lead to consequences that beget change (Brooks, 2011). Seixas (2017) laid out six historical thinking concepts that are generative in that each concept functions as a problem or a tension. These concepts are: historical significance and what makes it so, primary source evidence which calls for interpretation, continuity and change that asks what changes or remains the same and why, cause and consequence analysis that seeks to determine causation and conditions, historical perspective taking that asks learners to understand minds different from their own, and the ethical dimension in which judgments are made, injustice is addressed, and memorial obligations are considered (Seixas, 2017). While there is certainly overlap between Rantala et al. and Seixas, the latter adds the crucial components of historical perspective taking and the ethical dimension. These two components are integral pieces of historical empathy since learners strive to understand the historical perspective of a given figure as well as render an ethical judgment of the past on its own terms.

Pulling the threads of historical thinking together, it is evident that the practice of historical empathy asks learners to develop a wide number of skills that fall under the umbrella of historical thinking. For the Social Studies educator, then, historical empathy practices present an opportunity to exercise a variety of historical thinking skills whose goal is for learners to develop a mindset that sees complexity rather than simplicity and renders careful judgments based on valid evidence.

Goals & Benefits

In a simple form, the goal of historical empathy is to gain historical contextual knowledge such that learners greater understand the mindsets and motivations behind a given

decision (Virta & Kouki, 2014). In pursuit of this goal, a distinction can be drawn behind proximate goals, which are curricular in nature, and ultimate goals, that speak to enduring skills, understandings, and dispositions (Brooks & Endacott, 2013). This distinction, however, is somewhat porous in that proximate curricular goals can be ultimate goals as enduring understandings can be developed that lead to dispositional shifts in the learner that lasts over time. The current British Columbian curriculum, for example, illustrates this point as the desire for an active and informed citizen is both a proximate and an ultimate goal; "The main purpose of the Social Studies curriculum is to develop graduates who have the knowledge, skills, and competencies to be active, informed citizens" (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/core/goals-and-rationale).

In regards to proximate goals, historical empathy ticks off a number of boxes. To take but three examples, firstly, there is the research component as "students rely on sources to generate their explanations of the past" (Brooks, 2008, p. 143). Learners are encouraged to weigh the evidence rather than feel the pull of emotions (Brooks, et al. 2014). Digging deeply into first hand source material provides learners with the foundation to make the sort of informed ethical judgments for which the BC curriculum (2015) is looking. Secondly, the inquiry process that prompts learners to ask driving questions, gather and analyze data, and then communicate findings is nearly mirrored in the pedagogical process of historical empathy as students work through phases of introduction, investigation, display, and reflection (Brooks & Endacott 2013; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2014; Endacott & Sturtz, 2014). Thirdly, historical empathy meets the goal of explaining past perspectives in light of the political, economic, social, and cultural norms of the time through the development of historical contextualization (BC's New Curriculum, 2015; Huijgen et al., 2018). Taken together, both here and in previous sections, historical

empathy touches upon a wide range of proximate, or curricular, goals within a single unit of study.

Yet, it is the ultimate goals of historical empathy whose benefits may be most tantalizing to educators. At the cognitive level, there is evidence of the promotion of complex ideas, decision making, and moral judgements (Endacott, 2014). Learners are better able to establish connections between the past and present (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Further, learners have demonstrated improved contextualization and other historical thinking skills when compared to control groups (Huijgen et al., 2018). Evidence also shows that learners gain a deeper interest in the content and even develop a new perspective about themselves (Brauer, 2016). Affective connections to a historical figure's struggle allow learners to understand the complexity of historical events and phenomenon (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2014; Endacott & Sturtz, 2014). At the societal level, Brooks (2008) claims that the concept of empathy is "recognized as an essential element of effective participation in society" (p. 130) This claim is supported by Brauer (2016) who finds evidence that empathy, in general, is conducive toward socially-minded and altruistic behavior while lessening negative destructive forms of behavior. Indeed, democracy itself benefits from citizens who develop awareness of their own positions, then have the ability to set those positions aside to examine the views of others based on their given context, as is developed in historical empathy practices (Brooks, 2008). Uniting the cognitive and the affective, Endacott & Brooks (2013) suggest the most significant goal of historical empathy may be to "help students develop a stronger awareness of needs around them and a sense of agency to respond to these needs" (p. 45).

It is also important, I think, to balance these alluring goals and benefits against the human realities of the classroom. Cunningham (2009) points out that goals of historical empathy vary

according to teachers' depth of understanding of empathy, and historical empathy practices, coupled with their particular vision of the role of the teacher. Cunningham (2009) juxtaposes a teacher whose primary goals with historical empathy revolve around connecting the past to contemporary social justice issues with a teacher who uses employs historical empathy to advance learners understanding of that era of history only and how that contributes to national identity construction. Indeed, the learners' experience of historical empathy depends largely on that teacher's understanding of topic and their motivation for using it. To consider another point of criticism, Endacott (2014), an ardent supporter of the many benefits of historical empathy, together with Sturtz (2014), both claim there is a hole in the research regarding the effectiveness of historical empathy in reaching certain curricular goals. While the pair do not elaborate on those specific goals, the sheer volume of beneficial goals touched by historical empathy may be sufficient to overcome these criticisms.

Principles & Pedagogy

In the course of this literature review, three main principles are demonstrated as necessary for the classroom practice of historical empathy.

First, learners must have a depth of contextual knowledge whereby they gain an extensive understanding of the social, political, and cultural norms of the time (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; De Leur et al., 2017; Virta & Kouki, 2014). Without contextual knowledge, understanding becomes simple and superficial (Rantala et al., 2016) as learners are unable to make sense of the context that informs decisions and actions. Second, teachers need to recognize that historical empathy is a process that is developed through multiple activities over time (Cunningham, 2009; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Endacott & Stuartz, 2015; Perrotta, 2018). Developing historical empathy and historical thinking skills do not come naturally (Wineburg, 1999). Rather, they are

practices and ways of viewing phenomenon that are somewhat counter-intuitive and therefore require learners to be aware of their natural thinking habits as they cultivate historical thinking skills throughout a course or courses (Reisman & Wineburg, 2008; Wineburg, 1999; Wineburg, 2007). Third, learner success is predicated on their ability to overcome presentism, "a bias in which people assume that the same values, intentions, attitudes and beliefs existed in the past as they exist today" (Barton & Levstik, 2004 as cited in Huijgen et al., 2018, p. 413). Rantala et al. (2016) corroborate this statement when they emphasize that "most of all, historical empathy requires an understanding of the fact that historical actors do not share the same point of view as we do today" (p. 324). Therefore, while it can be a challenge, learners who do not step out of their contemporary worldviews are inevitably unable to imagine a historical actor's thought process as they may have experienced it and find themselves evaluating actions against the standard of contemporary values. As Wineburg (1999) makes clear, overcoming the simplicity of presentism is a primary goal of historical thinking, and necessarily, historical empathy. Thus, learner depth of historical contextual knowledge, teachers' acceptance of historical empathy development as a long process, and learner ability to step out of their worldview and into another combine to form a foundation upon which the edifice of historical empathy can be constructed.

Endacott & Brooks (2013) present a similar, though contrasting, articulation of three interrelated principles at the core of historical empathy: historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. Historical contextualization, as articulated, refers to the development of an understanding of the social, political, and cultural norms of the era that influenced a historical figure's actions and decisions. Perspective taking speaks to the learner's "understanding of another's prior lived experience, principles, positions, attitudes, and beliefs to understand how that person might have thought about the situation in question (Endacott &

Brooks, 2013, p. 43). This principle recognizes the importance of developing the sense of otherness described by Barton and Levstik (as cited in Brooks, 2011) as learners construct a deep understanding that historical actors have worldviews that are different from their own. Affective connection refers to the understanding that a historical figure's action can be influenced by an affective response that is similar yet different from a learner's own lived experience (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). The three principles described by Endacott & Brooks (2013) have been taken up and applied by a variety of Social Studies education researchers (De Leur et al., 2017; Huijgen et al., 2018; Rantala et al., 2016).

In terms of pedagogical practices, Foster & Yeager (1998) developed four phases for historical empathy instruction that are not introduced chronologically, but need to be considered by educators in all planning. The first phase focuses on personalizing the difficulties of the historical figure by making connections between the figure and the learner (Foster & Yeager, 1998; as cited in Endacott, 2010). The second phase works to construct context and chronology as the learner comes to terms with different values and ways of thinking (Foster & Yeager, 1998; as cited in Endacott, 2010). The third phase is the interpretation of historical evidence in which source material is used to develop insights (Foster & Yeager, 1998; as cited in Endacott, 2010). The final phase is building a narrative framework whereby teachers scaffold student learning through developing increasingly complex questions, leading discussions, correcting misunderstandings, providing further resources, and checking the validity of student reasoning (Foster & Yeager, 1998; as cited in Endacott, 2010).

Endacott & Brooks (2013) present a pedagogical model for historical empathy with four chronological phases: introduction, investigation, display, and reflection. The introduction phase is used to acquaint learners with both the historical situation and figure with "the ultimate

purpose of setting the scene and providing a lens through which the students will investigate the source material and media that follows" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 46). Learners may be given readings, documentaries, a timeline of events, pictures, and other artifacts that help lay the groundwork. (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). An essential question that speaks to a dilemma faced by a historical figure is posed as well as general questions designed to draw similar/ different connections between the learner and the historical figure, to focus attention on historical context, and to emphasize the importance of a historical situation (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). The investigation phase has activities intended for learners to "explore the nuances of historical context in depth as well as the thoughts and feelings of historical figures involved in particular situations and actions" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 48). Learners take a deep dive into a wide variety primary source documents, such as journals, letters, and speeches, to enhance their understanding of how historical figures felt, thought, then acted (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Additionally, learners develop an understanding of their own biases and positionalities with a goal of seeing how those influences shape their conclusions (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Specific questions are asked in the areas of general investigation, documentation, and essential questions that reveal the extent to which leaners understand context and the historical figure's worldview (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). The display phase calls for learners to show the product of their investigation and inquiry (Endacott & Brooks, 2013) . Learners return to their essential question and render their judgements based upon evidence. The most common tactic is through writing, and research tends to show that first-person responses are both more popular and show more historical empathy than third-person pieces, though they are also given to greater instances of presentism (Brooks, 2008). Other methods of display include creation of a museum display, dramatic re-enactments, a structured debate, poetry assignments, and historical roundtables

(Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Rather than conclude after the display phase, Endacott & Brooks (2013) argue for the inclusion of a final phase, reflection, that "invite(s) students to form opinions about the historical perspectives, feelings, actions, and circumstances they have closely examined" (p. 53). This is essentially a summation activity in which learners think about their thinking. Teachers guide learners toward the goal to "understand that both past and present ideas are the product of historical context" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 53) and "how a personal opinion can be the product of any number of influences outside of the individual" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 53). Questions in this phase are constructed around the following areas: reflection on the context of present principles, parallels between the past and the present, moral judgements and a disposition to act for the good of others (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Taken in its entirety, the model of pedagogical practice offered by Endacott & Brooks (2013) may an improvement over previous models due to its sequential order of phases, its exactness of goals, and its formulation of questions and activities designed to meet those goals at each step in the learning process.

The pedagogical vehicle that is most often used in light of these four phases is the historical simulation (De Leur et al., 2017; Endacott, 2014; Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Endacott & Sturtz, 2015; Perrotta, 2018). A common approach is to select a historical figure who faces a significant dilemma, such as Harry Truman and the decision to drop the nuclear bomb on Hiroshima (Endacott, 2014). Learners are asked questions to develop their understanding of the context as well as an essential question such as, "What is your position on Harry Truman's use of the atomic bomb to end World War II?" (Endacott, 2014, p. 7). To develop a sense of shared normalcy (Barton & Levstik, as cited in Endacott, 2014) learners are encouraged to find a similarity between themselves and the historical figure, through gender, culture, economic

background, life challenges, etc., as well as a dilemma in their own life that has some similarity to Truman's, ie. Have you ever made a decision that harmed someone in order to protect another? (Endacott, 2014). Learners are then provided with a wealth of primary documents such as Truman's diaries, reports from the Manhattan project, statements from scientists and military personnel, the Potsdam declaration, opinion polls from American citizens in 1945, etc. (Endacott, 2014). Learners work toward solving their essential question then display their answer in writing or other means before moving on to "metacognitive reflection" (Endacott, 2014, p.8) of the event with the benefit of hindsight that may bring to bear factors the historical figure was not aware of, such as nuclear radiation. This form of simulation has been employed around topics of Thomas Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase (Endacott, 2010), Athenian democracy and war with Sparta (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Endacott & Sturtz, 2015), the struggle for civil rights for African-Americans (Perrotta, 2018), and Finnish children taken to Sweden during WWII (Rantala et al., 2016). Simulations provide a ripe opportunity for historical empathy since learners are literally placed into the shoes of another during a complex situation.

Assessment of historical empathy can be somewhat challenging in that there are levels of historical empathy that learners fall into. Ashby and Lee (1987, as cited in Virta & Kouki, 2014) developed a five level scale to measure historical empathy: the divi past, generalized stereotypes, everyday empathy, restricted historical empathy, and contextual historical empathy. The divi past features ideas that can broadly be described as past actors being essentially ignorant, unintelligent and people who defy rational explanation (Virta & Kouki, 2014). Generalized stereotypes occur when the differences between the past and present are accounted for in simple and broad statements such as 'All Americans accepted the nuclear bombing being dropped on Hiroshima because they hated Japan for attacking Pearl Harbour' (Virta & Kouki, 2014).

Everyday empathy refers to projecting present ideas and feelings onto the past (Virta & Kouki, 2014). In this instance, a learner may look at the famous picture of the American sailor kissing a woman in Times Square at the end of WWII and wonder, 'Did he have consent?' (W. Dawson, Nov. 20, 2018). Restricted historical empathy can be seen when learners explain the past action on the context of the period, perhaps in terms of values, but still miss other aspects within the context of the period, such as economic conditions (Virta & Kouki, 2014). Finally, contextual historical empathy refers to a well-developed sense of empathy in which actions are evaluated entirely in light of the historical context without a trace of contemporary beliefs and values slipping in (Virta & Kouki, 2014). Levels 1-3 indicate a lack of historical empathy, while levels 4-5 demonstrate the opposite (Rantala et al., 2016). Indeed, at certain times in their written responses, learners can inhabit more than one level (Brooks, 2008; Rantala et al., 2016).

Finally, there is evidence that it is better for learners to be aware of the learning outcomes at an early stage since learners find them to be useful aides that focus their experience of historical empathy (Brooks, Dobbins, Scott, Rawlinson & Norman, 2014). However, in crafting learning outcomes, teachers need to avoid language that is unclear, imprecise, wordy or jargon laden as these elements make the outcome opaque and hard to realize (Brooks et al., 2014). Additionally, learning outcomes can impede creativity in that learners focus too much on those objectives and therefore restrict their learning (Brooks et al., 2014). The depth of learning the teacher is asking for needs to be clear as learners can "underestimate the level of learning required to pass an assessment from published learning outcomes (Brooks et al., 2014, p. 731). This concern can be overcome through the use of exemplars that clearly demark levels of achievement regarding those outcomes, as well as provide something tangible to visualize as the learning process unfolds. Ultimately, it is beneficial to articulate clear, concise and achievable

learning outcomes; however, those outcomes should be “a guide for their learning, but not to be the sole focus of it” (Brooks et al., 2014, p.731).

Challenges to Historical Empathy

In addition to the paramount challenge of developing sufficient contextual knowledge of the era, the challenges to historical empathy can be as varied as the educators who teach it (Cunningham, 2009). That said, a review of the literature reveals three reoccurring challenges: learner limitations of empathy, natural tendencies toward presentism, and an equally natural slide into egotistical drift. Each challenge, unresolved, can prove fatal to the development of historical empathy in a classroom.

Empathy is a complex term that takes different shapes according to its philosophical, psychological, and sociological definitions (Brauer, 2016). Its “conceptual confusion” (Cunningham, p.2009, p. 679) was strong enough to dominate debate in Britain during the 1980s. For learners of social studies, empathy poses two challenges: empathizing with people of the past, and with people from different geographical areas (Brauer, 2016). Primary sources can help learners paint something of a picture of the past, but they are, after all, in a classroom many years removed from the historical figure or the situation. This is a gap that imagination may not be able to fill. Additionally, the varied geographical terrain entails cultural traditions that differ so much in time and space that they may be unidentifiable to the outsider. Even after a unit on historical empathy Brooks (2008) observed a distinct lack of empathy: “it does not occur to these students that the past peoples they are studying might think entirely differently from themselves, even if they are the same age and gender” (p. 141), showing just how tough the challenge can be. Cunningham (2009) draws attention to the limits of a teacher to both assess what happens in the

minds of learners during class and to develop activities that actually “recreate the perspectives of the past” (p. 696). One can then deduce that if a teacher cannot recreate those perspectives with authenticity, then learners are experiencing little more than imaginative role play in the place of historical empathy, and assessment becomes a measurement of fantasy. If empathy is not achieved, then Brauer (2009) posits that historical learning itself is reduced, while Endacott (2014) claims that the “humanizing benefits are lost” (p. 293). Under this array of challenges, redefining the goal of empathy to something more tangible and realistic is a logical response. Perhaps Brooks (2011) offers a tentative solution through the concept of care whereby historical empathy is considered achieved if learners care: about the past, that the event occurred, for those harmed in the event, and to put learning into action.

Presentism is a common and formidable obstacle to historical empathy. This term describes the tendency for learners to view, as Wineburg (1999) said, “the past through the lens of the present” (p. 496). Case studies by Endacott (2010) and Huijgen et al. (2018) recount how quickly and naturally learners fall into presentism when asked to step into the roles of a historical figure. This behavior, and particularly a rush to judgement, was also observed by Endacott and Pelekanos (2015) in the Athenian simulation, in the Elizabeth Jennings project by Perrotta (2018), and in Rantala et al.’s (2016) unit on Finnish children in WWII. This ubiquitous problem leads to moral judgements on the part of the learners that are neither attached to historical reality nor contextual evidence (De Leur et al., 2017). These poor moral judgements are especially concerning since ethical reasoning skills are among the highest of goals in historical empathy and thinking (Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Seixas, 2015; Wineburg, 1999). In terms of solutions to this challenge, the response may be three-fold. First, it is vital that learners are aware of what presentism is, how easily it occurs, and the danger to judgment it poses. Huijgen et al. (2018)

make this such an important aspect of historical empathy development that they created tension laden questionnaires aimed at exposing this mental habit: “we therefore aim to make students aware of the consequences of a present oriented perspective when examining the past by creating cognitive incongruity” (p. 413). In addition to facilitating learner understanding of presentism, teachers can follow the example by Pelekanos (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015) by recognizing when presentism arises in work or discussion, draw attention to it, then ask compare and contrast questions that highlight differences between past and present. Cunningham (2009) noted that teachers would avoid using the pronoun ‘you’ in discussion and questioning to avoid presentism. These two examples show a reactive and proactive decision by the teacher to consciously address presentism before and when it arises. Finally, Pelekanos (as cited in Endacott & Sturtz, 2015) countered presentism with a wide range of primary and secondary documents to serve as evidence the learner could be reminded of when presentism began it appear. This solution also helps to realize the goal of historical empathy to render judgement based on evidence rather than on feelings (Brooks et al., 2014). While for educators, presentism remains a significant challenge that learners frequently and naturally fall into, this can be mitigated by: making the learners aware of the concept and its implications; the teacher taking conscious steps to limit and respond to presentism; and providing a wealth of historical evidence for learners to build their judgements upon rather than reactions shaped by contemporary values.

First coined by Hoffman (1984, as cited in Endacott, 2010), egotistical drift is “the phenomenon that can occur when one focuses too intently on the self and loses sight of the other’s condition” (p.13). The I, or the ego, takes over and the question becomes not why did Truman drop the atomic bomb, but why I would have chosen to drop the bomb. Ironically, it is the affective connection that can facilitate egotistical drift when learners, for example, get too

carried away by passion when writing in the role of a historical president (Endacott, 2010). Additionally, when the learner finds a shared human experience with the historical figure, there is evidence that this affective connection leads to an increased likelihood of egotistical drift (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). This phenomenon also occurs more readily when the topic under study is close to a personally held belief, such the value of personal freedom (Endacott, 2010). This issue of how the learner would feel versus how the historical figure may have felt is for Cunningham (2009) an “unresolved dilemma” (p. 689) that may never reach a satisfactory resolution. As a counter-measure, Endacott (2010) suggests greater contextual knowledge to understand the historical figure’s uniqueness. Further, there is evidence that investigating the possible influences of affective forces on the historical figure’s actions, learners lessen their risk egotistical drift (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Finally, Endacott and Sturtz (2015) report some success in addressing the problem by returning learners’ attention to the enduring understandings the course or unit is built upon as a way to focus, shift the dialogue, highlight evidence, and guide toward a less egocentric view.

Areas for Further Research

There is an abundance of research articulating the struggle to define historical empathy (Cunningham, 2009; Endacott, 2010; Perrotta & Bohan, 2018), its connection to historical thinking (Seixas, 2017 ; Wineburg, 1999; Wineburg, 2006), theoretical frameworks to implement in classrooms (Cunningham, 2009; Endacott & Brooks, 2013; Virta & Kouki, 2014), and ways to develop assessment models (Brooks, 2008). There is still room for further research in specific areas around the affective dimension of historical empathy (Endacott & Brooks, 2013), learners

with disabilities (De La Paz & Wissinger, 2015), and learners with unique social identities (Perrotta, 2018).

The affective component of historical empathy was highlighted with greatest effect by Endacott and Brooks (2013) with their conception of historical empathy as a dual-dimensional construct. Given the recentness of this work, the pair point out that most studies looking at the display phase, or output, of historical empathy "have not given any attention to the affective dimension of historical empathy" (p. 55). There is a pressing need, they argue, for scholars to consider how the affective component helps develop the dispositional benefits of historical empathy (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). Furthermore, there is scant research analyzing student response to affective goals (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). It is perhaps the relative novelty of the formalized affective connection that presents an opportunity for further fruitful research.

There is also a need for further research on how historical empathy supports the concept of inclusion. As stated in the Introduction to BC's Redesigned Curriculum, inclusion is an important consideration for all educators in their educational planning; "British Columbia promotes an inclusive educational system in which students with special needs are fully participating members of a community of learners. Inclusion describes the principle that all students are entitled to equitable access to learning, achievement, and the pursuit of excellence in all aspects of educational programs" (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/sites/curriculum.gov.bc.ca /files/pdf/ curriculum_intro.pdf). As a consequence of the commitment, classroom teachers are responsible for the educational planning for all learners as district special needs programs have been closed and, therefore, classroom teachers may have students with unique learning needs and preferences with which the teachers have had little experience. Students with certain diagnoses, such as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), often struggle tremendously in the same thing-same

time-same way model of schooling. These learners are entitled to adaptations and modifications that align with their abilities. In regards historical empathy, there is little research focused on learners with disabilities overall, and with ASD in particular. De La Paz and Wissinger (2015) provide evidence that after being given accommodations, such as a reader, learners with disabilities were able to develop written responses that were similar to their same age peers in terms of historical thinking, quality, and length. However, the pair did not go into the nature of the disabilities nor indicate what kinds of written supports were utilized. For learners with ASD, empathy is a very challenging concept and there currently is a lack of research regarding this particular group and their experiences with historical empathy. Educators can consider using differentiation to provide adaptations and modifications to encourage learners to engage with the content, alter pacing, and allow learners to demonstrate learning in a personally meaningful way (Bingham, 2017). Individual Education Plans (IEPs) can also serve as a foundation for both instruction and assessment. However, more research needs to be done so that teachers can help facilitate success for learners with challenges.

Finally, there is a need for further research around students with diverse social identities and the extent to which they find success in historical empathy practices. Social identities refer to an individual's diverse range of racial affiliations, cultural backgrounds, gender identities, socio-economic statuses, and English language abilities (Perrotta, 2018). Perrotta (2018) uncovers a "historical empathy gap" (p. 65) in which Caucasian students did better at aspects of historical contextualization, while minority students had stronger affective responses to the content. Given the increasing diversity in Canadian schools, there is a need to develop research that looks at ELL and refugee learners and how they experience historical empathy. Learners who cannot make an affective connection with the historical figure are less likely to develop historical

empathy (Endacott, 2010; Endacott & Sturtz, 2015). What is the best way to engage the learner from China, Korea, India, Vietnam, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Italy in a historical empathy unit on 20th century Canada? Perhaps the American learner studying classical Athens (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015) is no more different than the Syrian refugee wrestling with Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb. Further research in this vital area can help to provide those answers.

Chapter 3- The Simulation

Rationale for the FLQ Crisis

From the U.S.A. to Finland, simulations have been used as a vehicle to develop historical empathy in Social Studies classes (Endacott & Pelekanos, 2015; Huijgen, et al., 2018; Perrotta, 2018). Learners are placed in the role of a historical actor faced with a controversial choice (Endacott, 2015). Learners develop historical contextualization through engagement with primary documents as they seek to understand the world as the historical actor did (Brooks, 2008). Ultimately, learners develop historical empathy from the actor's dilemma as they struggle with the potential consequences of the decision (Endacott, 2010).

The FLQ Crisis of October 1970 is a suitable simulation choice for a number of reasons. Firstly, the simulation can be anchored to Prime Minister P.E. Trudeau's dilemma of whether or not to invoke the War Measures Act in peacetime, an unprecedented reach of federal power. Both sides in the dilemma have well developed arguments and considerations for learners to evaluate (Cranny & Moles, 2010). Secondly, this crisis invites learners to examine the larger context of Quebec nationalism and separatism that developed out of the 1960s Quiet Revolution. Learners will develop knowledge about the FLQ bombing campaigns and other politically motivated violence committed by the FLQ to gain this contextual understanding. This learning

has direct links to curricular objectives. For example, engaging with primary documents, such as the FLQ Manifesto and Pierre La Porte's letter to Premier Bourassa, and secondary documents, such as a timeline of the FLQ Crisis events and a biography of P.E. Trudeau will provide learners the opportunity to meet curricular competencies such as "assess how underlying conditions and the actions of individuals or groups influence events, decisions, or developments, and analyze multiple consequences" (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/10/). Additionally, the short-term and long-term consequences of this conflict and how they have shaped perspectives of Canadians thereafter, speak to one of the Big Ideas in Social Studies 10 that recognizes how "regional conflicts have been a powerful force in shaping our contemporary world and identities" (https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/10/). A final reason for the FLQ crisis being an optimal choice for a simulation centers around learner engagement. The FLQ crisis has the drama of high profile kidnappings and ransom demands, an intersection of complex issues such as self-determination, federalism, and terrorism, and moving human stories, particularly concerning Pierre La Porte, that coalesce to create a highly engaging learning experience featuring affective and cognitive connections.

Rationale for Resources

- *A timeline of Quebec nationalism, 1917 to 1969*

This timeline begins with the conscription crisis in the Great War, in which Quebec was the only province that overwhelming opposed conscription, and culminates with the Official Languages Act that recognized French as an official language of Canada. The periods of the Great Darkness and the Quiet Revolution are also included in this timeframe. The intention of

this resource is to develop learners' sense of the main events in Quebec, particularly a rise in Quebec nationalism.

- *A reading on the FLQ and their bombing campaign in the 1960s*

This reading facilitates learner understanding of who the FLQ were, their motivations, their actions, and the consequences of those actions up to the FLQ crisis itself. It is, in my view, important to highlight the group's use of violence, particularly the bombing campaigns, that preceded the kidnappings of James Cross and Pierre La Porte and be aware of the fears associated with this radical group.

- *A selection of pictures of the aftermath of the bombings.*

This resource is intended to supplement the reading on the FLQ. Learners will develop a visual sense of scope and scale of the destruction, as well as the human cost. Learners will see how the FLQ targeted symbols of English-Canada, such as Canada Post and McGill university.

- *A biography of P.E. Trudeau up until the FLQ crisis in 1970.*

This resource is intended to develop leaners' understanding of the figure with whose dilemma they will engage. If learners are to develop empathy toward Trudeau's dilemma, then it is beneficial to understanding his upbringing in Quebec, his previous political experience, his ideological perspectives, and his views of Quebec nationalism and Canadian federalism. Understanding who Mr. Trudeau was and how he perceived the world is integral to grasping his response to this unparalleled crisis.

- *A timeline of events in the FLQ crisis up until P.E. Trudeau's decision to invoke the War Measures Act.*

This resource provides a detailed breakdown of the events of the crisis up to Prime Minister Trudeau's decision to invoke the War Measures Act (WMA). This resource develops

historical contextualization by showing learners what happened, but not what happened next. In this way, they are in a similar position to the Prime Minister when he had to decide on the War Measures Act.

- *A reading on the powers of the War Measures Act that are given to the federal government and how the Act curtails certain civil liberties.*

If learners are to decide on whether or not to invoke the WMA, then it is critical that they understand what the WMA is, the explicit powers it gives to the federal government, how it curtails citizens civil liberties, and its historic use in Canada. Learners will be aware of how momentous this piece of legislation is and how unprecedented its use is during peacetime in Canada.

- *A copy of the FLQ Manifesto that was read on TV during the crisis.*

This primary document supplements a screening of the manifesto's broadcast as Canadians would have seen it at the time. This resource provides a valuable articulation of the FLQs goals and what Prime Minister Trudeau would have had to bear in mind when considering the WMA.

- *Any copies of the FLQ communiques that were sent to the media up until the decision to invoke the War Measures Act.*

These primary documents further develop learners' understanding of the FLQ as a group, in terms of goals and strategies, as well as develop insight into how the events unfolded day-to-day.

- *A video of Prime Minister Trudeau announcing to Canadians the War Measures Act and his justification for it.*

This primary resource puts learners in the position of ordinary Canadians at the time when they learned of the imposition of the WMA and the reasons for it. The intention of this resource is for learners to determine to what extent they empathize with the rationale for Mr. Trudeau's decision.

- *A copy of the letter by Pierre La Porte to Premier Robert Bourassa.*

This primary document provides much of the emotional power of this simulation. The extent to which Mr. La Porte's subsequent murder is attributed to Mr. Trudeau's use of the WMA provides an opportunity for rich discussion during the reflection phase.

- *Readings on the consequences of invoking the War Measures Act*

These secondary documents are provided during the reflection phase and facilitate learner thinking about their position in the dilemma.

The Driving Question

In his simulation on President Truman and the atomic bomb, Endacott (2010) used the simple driving question, "Should President Truman drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima?" (p. 8). In a similar vein, I propose the driving question on the FLQ crisis as, "Should Prime Minster Trudeau invoke the War Measures Act in response to the actions of the FLQ?"

This driving question compels learners to take a position, and therefore, have reasons for the position that are rooted in evidence. Also, learners will need to consider the points raised by the opposite side and have an answer for them.

This question also sets out three topics for study: Prime Minister Trudeau, the War Measures Act, and the FLQ.

Simulation Phase- Introduction

This brief phase works to "set the scene" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 46) by introducing learners to the historical context and then to biographical information about the historical actor. To provide an initial dive into context, learners can be given the timeline of Quebec nationalism, a reading on the FLQ and their bombing campaign in the 1960s, and pictures of the aftermath of the bombings. These resources will begin to paint a picture of the wide variety of perspectives and actions that existed in Quebec at this time. To begin to develop the viewpoint of the historical actor, learners can read a biography of P.E. Trudeau up until the FLQ crisis. Additionally, to develop the affective connection between the learner and the historical actor, learners need to "reflect on prior experiences they have had that might connect to the content to be explored" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 48). This can be accomplished by asking questions: Have you ever had to protect someone before? How did you protect that person? Have you ever had to take steps to protect someone that upset others? How did you explain your actions? These questions help to establish an affective connection that is required to develop historical empathy later on. Table 1 provides a set of questions designed to "ready students to grapple with historical perspectives that will likely differ from their own" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 47).

Table 1 *Sample Questions for Introductory Activities for Historical Empathy*	
To consider personal similarities and differences between students and historical figures	Have you ever had to protect someone before? How did you protect that person? Have you ever had to take steps to protect someone that upset others? How did you explain your actions? How do you think you are similar or different from Mr. Trudeau? Do you think Mr. Trudeau would make a decision to protect people even if it was unpopular?

To draw attention to historical context	How has the political environment changed in Quebec? How were the goals of the people looking to modernize Quebec similar or different from the goals of people in Quebec today? What were the key events of the Quiet Revolution? What does the violence of the FLQ tell us about what was going on in Quebec at this time?
To emphasize the importance of a historical situation	Why do you think we are going to spend multiple classes trying to determine the thoughts of Quebec people in this period as well as the thoughts of Mr. Trudeau toward Quebec's place in Canada? Why do you think it is important to determine what you have in common with Mr. Trudeau?

Simulation Phase- Investigation

The goal of this phase is to "explore the nuances of historical context in depth as well as the thoughts and feelings of historical figures involved in particular situations and actions" (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 48). The heart of this phase is learner engagement with the following primary documents: a timeline of events in the FLQ crisis up until P.E. Trudeau's decision to invoke the War Measures Act; a reading on the powers of the War Measures Act that are given to the federal government and how the Act curtails certain civil liberties; a copy of the FLQ Manifesto that was read on TV during the crisis; any copies of the FLQ communiques that were sent to the media up until the decision to invoke the War Measures Act; and a copy of the letter by Pierre La Porte to Premier Robert Bourassa. These primary resources provide an opportunity for a more detailed examination of historical context as learners witness the drama of the events as they unfolded.

Another feature of this phase is the evaluation of the primary documents themselves as questions are asked about the validity of the sources. Learners are asked about the authors of the

documents, the intentions, the intended audience, and the circumstances in which each document was created. Evaluating the content of the resources is beneficial in achieving the goal of achieving historical empathy while determining the validity of the resource itself speaks to larger curricular skills in Social Studies.

The role of the teacher in this phase is to help focus learners on the issues of greatest substance, be watchful of the pitfalls of presentism and egotistical drift, be prepared to correct as necessary, and to take the perspective of Mr. Trudeau as they examine the content of the documents.

Table 2 *Sample Questions for Investigation Activities for Historical Empathy*

General investigative questions	How do you think the information in this source might have influenced Mr. Trudeau's thinking and actions? What does this document tell you about how the historical figure may have felt about the situation? Can you find a personal connection to what Mr. Trudeau may have felt at this time? What options are on the table to respond to this crisis? Which is the best one?
Document specific questions	Who created the document or artifact? When and why was it created? For whom? Under what circumstances? What does this document tell you about the atmosphere in Quebec at this time? What biases do you see in this document?
Essential questions	What tensions did Mr. Trudeau have to balance in responding to this crisis? What is the War Measures Act and why would invoking it in peacetime be controversial? What are the objectives of the FLQ? What precedent would be set if the Prime Minister gave in to the demands of the FLQ? Are Mr. Trudeau's reasons for invoking the WMA consistent with what you know of him and his political beliefs?

Simulation Phase- Display

The display phase is for learners to “formally display the empathy they have been working at” (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 52). Learner display activities focus on responses to the driving question highlighted in the introduction phase. The goal of this phase is for learners to “display empathy…to draw their own conclusions or make their own historical argument about a past experience, belief, decision, or action” (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 52).

Modes of display often center around first-person narrative writing tasks, which research has shown to convey higher levels of empathy than third-person writing (Brooks, 2008). Other modes of display can include a podcast/ recording or public speech of a learner responding to the driving question, a museum display, a structured debate, and a role-playing interview between a reporter and the historical actor.

Simulation Phase- Reflection

The reflection phase is an important step for learners to consolidate their knowledge of the topic and their thinking on historical empathy. Learners are invited to “form opinions about the historical perspectives, feelings, actions, and circumstances they have closely examined” (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 53) and to “express their reactions to historical content, to make moral judgments, and to use these responses to motivate actions in the present (Endacott & Brooks, 2013, p. 54).

Reflection activities can take the form of a personal written response, a learner-teacher interview, a class/ group discussion, a blog or wiki post, a video, or a recording. The teacher can support these reflections by providing a reading on the consequences of the decision to invoke the WMA.

Table 3	*Sample Questions for Reflection Activities for Historical Empathy*

To invite reflection on the context of present perspectives	How has the FLQ crisis impacted the way Canadians view terrorism today? How has the FLQ crisis shaped the way Canadians view Quebec separatism? How are the perspectives of people in the past similar or different from the perspectives we hold today? What are the factors that influence these differences?
To consider parallels between the past and the present	How are the manifestations of Quebec separatism different today than at the time of the FLQ crisis? How might the government's response be different if this crisis happened today? Have any Canadian leaders been placed in a similar situation as Mr. Trudeau was in?
To invite moral judgments and a disposition to act for the good of others	Do you believe Mr. Trudeau was right to invoke the WMA? Why or why not? Why is it important to study this event? What were your difficulties, if any, in empathizing with Mr. Trudeau's decision? How can we determine whether an action in the past was the right one? Is it possible for an action to have adequate justification in the past but not in the present?

Assessment

By its nature, empathy is an internal operation whose depth is unseen by the teacher. Still, there are outward characteristics, such as how a learner expresses their thinking in speech or writing, that can provide an indication of the extent to which the learner empathizes with the historical figure.

Yilmaz (2014) states that historical empathy is achieved when the learners demonstrate four key criteria. One, the learner recognizes that the present and past are distinct such that historical events are unique to a given place and time period. Two, the learner is able to explain the perspectives of the historical figure accurately and outline the consequences of the figure's decisions. Three, the learner is able to use historical evidence to accurately develop perspectives.

Four, the learner shows an ability to distinguish between a variety of historical perspectives and move smoothly between viewpoints. While these four criteria can be helpful for educators, there are two concerns that may limit the effectiveness of Yilmaz's (2014) method for determining whether or not historical empathy was achieved.

First, Yilmaz's (2014) criteria seems to suggest that historical empathy is something that is either achieved or it is not. This black and white view may overlook the grey areas in which learners may, for example, have empathized with a historical figures beliefs and values, but may not fully grasp the context of the time period. The learner, then, may achieve some empathy, but it is short of a fully developed sense of historical empathy. There does not seem to be a place in Yilmaz's (2014) criteria for these learners.

Second, Yilmaz's (2014) criteria lack the affective connection that is central to the work of Endacott and Brooks (2013). Criteria one through three seem exclusively like intellectual tasks that include the mind but not the heart, such as drawing upon evidence to inform a perspective. The fourth criterion is a complex task that requires the understanding and adoption of multiple perspectives which achieves empathy, albeit in a more cognitive way. Endacott and Brooks (2013) argued that historical empathy required perspective taking, historical contextualization, and affective connection. As such, neither research would likely support adoption of Yilmaz's (2014) criteria for assessing whether or not learners developed historical empathy.

Virta and Kouki (2014) and Perrotta (2018) have developed similar five level scales to assess the extent to which learners develop historical empathy with greater nuance than that of Yilmaz (2014). The first level for Virta and Kouki (2014) is called the *divi-past*, in which the past is irrational and historical actors are ignorant and unknowable. Perrotta (2018) simply calls

this *level 1- no evidence of historical empathy* as the learner's understanding is inaccurate and they are unable to move beyond contemporary beliefs and values. The second level of Virta and Kouki (2014) is *generalized stereotypes* in which the difference between the past and present is accounted for on the basis of broad statements that lack detail. An example of generalized stereotypes would be the statement like, "Canadians were racist in the past and are less so now." Of course, there is some truth to the statement, but the broadness of the generalization diminishes the level of accuracy. Some Canadians, perhaps many, were indeed racist in the past, but not all. Similarly, racism has decreased in Canada, but not in all quarters. For Perrotta (2018), *level 2- some evidence of historical empathy*, is seen when learners use generalizations to suggest that this past is dysfunctional when compared to the present. A statement in this level would be "People in the past didn't know how terrible racism is, but nowadays, people know this." The third level for Virta and Kouki (2014) is called *everyday empathy*. Learners who find themselves in this category attempt a rational explanation of the past based on the contextual evidence, but they project contemporary feelings and ideas onto the past. Perrotta (2018) states that *level 3- moderate level of historical empathy*, contains generalizations, but without the mistakes seen in level 1 and 2. For Perrotta (2018), generalizations are anathema to historical thinking and learners who use them demonstrate the lowest level of empathy. Virta and Kouki (2014) call the fourth level on their scale *restricted historical empathy*. This level sees learners explain the past, in part, as a result of the prevailing beliefs and values, but they don't fully grasp the conditions and atmosphere at the time. A learner at this level may understand, for example, Mr. Trudeau's opposition to Quebec separatism stemming from his commitment to federalism, but the learner may not be aware of the extent to which Quebec separatism by any means necessary was gaining popular support among the population. Perrotta (2018) has a corresponding point on the scale

called *level 4- moderate to high level of historical empathy*. In this level, learners explain perspectives based on context, but may render judgements using present values. Using these present values to assess the past is similar to Virta and Kouki's (2014) *everyday empathy*, but the understanding of context has exceeded their *restricted historical empathy* in which learners have not fully absorbed the atmosphere of the age. Finally, *contextual historical empathy* is the fifth level for Virta and Kouki (2014) in which learners clearly distinguish between what we know now, what was known then, and judgements are rendered fully in the context in which the decision was taken. Perrotta (2018) arrives at a similar destination, *level 5- high level of historical empathy*, whereby learners demonstrate that people in the past made decisions based upon the conditions, beliefs, and values of the time without slipping into presentism.

While there are similarities and some minor differences in the two five level scales, educators would be well served to adopt either framework as they provide a place for emergent understanding and partial development of historical empathy that is not seen in the criteria of Yilmaz (2014).

Appendix 1

Timeline of Quebec from 1917 to 1969

- **1917**- Government enforced conscription, rioting occurred in Montreal and Quebec City
- **1918-** Women won right to vote in Canadian federal elections
- **1921-** Ku Klux Klan established in Montreal

- **1922-** Joseph-Armand Bombardier engineered first prototype of snowmobile; CKAC Radio began broadcasting *(first radio station in Quebec)*
- **1931-** Statute of Westminster provided all existing dominions of British Empire were fully independent of United Kingdom
- **1936-** Canadian government began printing bilingual currency
- **1939-** Canada began participation in World War II
- **1940-** Quebec women received right to vote and run for office in provincial elections
- **1944-** W.L. Mackenzie, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill met for a World War II conference in Quebec City, Conscription meets opposition in Quebec, Maurice Duplessis elected as Premeir of Quebec.
- **1949-** Joseph-Albert Guay responsible for in-flight bombing killing all aboard *(one of first in-flight airplane bombings in history)*; asbestos strikes occurred in town of Asbestos and Thetford Mines
- **1954-** Separate provincial income tax introduced
- **1955-** Richard Riot - Fans protested suspension of Montreal hockey player, Maurice Richard; riots occurred
- **1959-** Death of Duplessis, the era of the Great Darkness is over
- **1960-** Jean Lessage becomes Premier with the slogan "Masters of our own House" and begins the Quiet Revolution
- **1961-** Claire Kirkland-Casgrain became first woman member of Legislative Assembly and cabinet member
- **1963-** Voting age lowered from 21 to 18 years, FLQ set off 15 mailbox bombs in Westmount, Montreal.
- **1969-** Bill 63 allowed parents freedom to choose their children's language of instruction; baseball franchise, Montreal Expos, began playing; FLQ *(Front de Liberation du Quebec)* bombed Montreal Stock Exchange; Montreal's police, firefighters staged wildcat strike

Appendix 2

Reading on the Quiet Revolution

The Quiet Revolution- the Canadian encyclopedia

https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/quiet-revolution

Appendix 3

Photos of the FLQ Bombing Campaign

https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/jan-1-1969-when-flq-bombs-rang-in-the-new-year-for-montrealers/article33462689/

http://www.canadiansoldiers.com/history/domesticmissions/flqcrisis.htm

https://opentextbc.ca/postconfederation/flq-mailbox-bomb/

http://www.larevolutiontranquille.ca/en/le-front-de-liberation-du-quebec.php

https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2017/01/30/quebec-city-shooting_n_14496576.html

Appendix 4

Reading on the biography of P.E. Trudeau

Pierre Eliot Trudeau- the Canadian Encyclopedia

https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/pierre-elliott-trudeau

Appendix 5

The Timeline of the FLQ Crisis

FLQ Crisis-Timeline

October 5, 1970
British Trade Commissioner James Cross was kidnapped in Montreal, Quebec. Ransom demands from the Liberation cell of the FLQ included the release of 23 "political prisoners," $500,000 in gold, broadcast and publication of the FLQ Manifesto, and an aircraft to take the kidnappers to Cuba or Algeria.

October 6, 1970
Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa agreed that decisions on the FLQ demands would be made jointly by the federal government and the Quebec provincial government.

The FLQ Manifesto, or excerpts of it, was published by several newspapers.

Radio station CKAC received threats that James Cross would be killed if FLQ demands were not met.

October 7, 1970
Quebec Justice Minister Jerome Choquette said he was available for negotiations.

The FLQ Manifesto was read on CKAC radio.

October 8, 1970
The FLQ Manifesto was read on the CBC French network Radio-Canada.

October 10, 1970
The Chenier cell of the FLQ kidnapped Quebec Minister of Labour Pierre Laporte.

October 11, 1970
Premier Bourassa received a letter from Pierre Laporte pleading for his life.

October 12, 1970
The Army was sent in to guard Ottawa.

October 15, 1970
The Quebec government invited the Army into Quebec to help local police.

October 16, 1970
Prime Minister Trudeau announced the proclamation of the War Measures Act, emergency legislation dating from World War I.

Appendix 6

Reading on the War Measures Act

The War Measures Act- the Canadian Encyclopedia

https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/war-measures-act

Appendix 7

The FLQ Manifesto

http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/docs/october/documents/FLQManifesto.pdf

Appendix 8

Communiques from the FLQ

https://historyofrights.ca/wp-content/uploads/documents/OC_demands_FLQ.pdf

Appendix 9

P.E. Trudeau announces the War Measures Act

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PHaoBD-eakk

Appendix 10

Pierre Laporte's letter to Robert Bourassa

Letter sent on October 11, 1970

My dear Robert,

I feel like I am writing the most important letter I have ever written.
For the time being, I am in perfect health, and I am treated well, even courteously.

In short, the power to decide over my life is in your hands. If there was only that involved, and the sacrifice of my life would bring good results, one could accept it ...

You know how my personal situation deserves to draw attention. I had two brothers, both are now dead. I remain alone as the head of a large family that comprises my mother, my sisters, my own wife and my children, and the children of Rolland of whom I am the guardian. My departure would create for them irreparable grief, and you know the ties that bind the members of my family ...

You have the power of life and death over me, I depend on you and I thank you for it.

Best regards,
Pierre Laporte

Appendix 11

Readings on the Aftermath of the War Measures Act and the FLQ Crisis

1. The FLQ Crisis Reinterpreted

www.cbc.ca/news/canada/the-october-crisis-reinterpreted-1.940346

2. The October Crisis

https://historyofrights.ca/history/october-crisis/

3. Chronology of the FLQ Crisis, 1970, and its Aftermath

http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/chronos/october.htm

Reference List

John A. Macdonald statue removed from Victoria City Hall. (2018, Aug.11). Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/john-a-macdonald-statue-victoria-city-hall-lisa-helps-1.4782065

Bingham, A. (2017). Personalized learning in high technology charter schools. *Journal of educational change*, 18:529-549. doi:10.1007/s10833-017-9305-0

BC's New Curriculum, Social Studies 10. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/10/ & https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca/curriculum/social-studies/core/goals-and-rationale

Brauer, J. (2016). Empathy as an emotional practice in historical pedagogy. *Miscellanea anthropologica et sociologica*, 17b(4): 27-44.

Brooks, S. (2008). Displaying historical empathy: What impact can a writing assignment have? *Social studies research and practice*, 3:2, 130-146. Retrieved from http://www.socstrp.org

Brooks, S. (2011). Historical empathy as perspective recognition and care in one secondary social studies classroom. *Theory & research in social education*, 39:2, 166-202. doi:10.1080/00933104.2011.1047352

Brooks, S., Dobbins, K., Scott, J., Rawlinson, M. & Norman, R. (2014). Learning about learning outcomes: The students perspective. *Teaching in higher education*, 19:6, 721-733, doi:10.1080/1356217.2014.901964

Cranny, M. & Moles, G. (2010). *Counterpoints: Exploring Canadian issues*. Toronto, ON: Pearson.

Cunningham, D.L. (2009). An empirical framework for understanding how teachers conceptualize and cultivate historical empathy in students. *Journal of curriculum studies*, 41:5. doi:10.1080/00220270902947376

De La Paz, S. & Wissinger, D. (2015). Effects of genre and content knowledge on historical thinking with academically diverse high school students. *The journal of experimental education*, 83(1), 110-129. doi:10.1080/00220973.2013.876228

De Leur, T., van Boxtel, C. & Wilschut, A. (2017) I saw angry people and broken statues: Historical empathy in secondary history education. *British journal of educational studies*, 65:3, 331-352. doi:1080/0071005.2017.1291902

Endacott, J. (2010). Reconsidering affective engagement in historical empathy. *Theory & research in social education*, 38:1, 6-47. doi:10.1080/00933104.2010.10473415

Endacott, J. & Brooks, S. (2013). An updated theoretical and practical model for promoting historical empathy. *Social studies research and practice*, 8:1, 4157.

Endacott, J. (2014). Negotiating the process of historical empathy. *Theory and research in social education*, 42:1, 4-34. doi:10.1080/00933104.2013.826158

Endacott, J. & Pelekanos, C. (2015). Slaves, women and war! Engaging middle school students in historical empathy for enduring understanding. *The social studies*, 106:1, 1-7.
Doi:10.1080/00377996.2014.957378

Endacott, J. & Sturtz, J. (2015). Historical empathy and pedagogical reasoning. *The journal of social studies research*, 39:1-16. Retrieved from http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jssr

Foster, S.J. & Yeager, E.A. (1998). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. *International journal of social education*, 13:1, 1-7.

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. doi:10.1080/00220272.2018.1435724

Introduction to BC's redesigned curriculum. (2015). Retrieved from https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca /sites/curriculum.gov.bc.ca/files/pdf/curriculum_intro.pdf

Perrotta, K. & Bohan, C. (2018). More than a feeling: Tracing the progressive era origins of historical empathy in the social studies curriculum, 1890-1940s. *The journal of social studies Research*, 42:27-37. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.

Perrotta, K. (2018). A study of students' social identities and a "historical empathy gap" in middle school and secondary classes with the intstructional unit "the Elizabeth Jennings Project". *Curriculum and teaching dialogue*, 20: 1&2, 53-69.

Rantala, J., Manningen, M., & van den Berg, M. (2016). Stepping into other people's shoes proves to be a difficult task for high school students: assessing historical empathy through simulation exercise. *Journal of curriculum studies*, 48:3, 323-345. doi:10.1080/00220272.2015.1122092.

Reisnam, A. & Wineburg, S. (2008). Teaching the skill of contextualizing in history. *The social studies*, 99:5, 202-207. doi:10.3200/TSSS.99.5.202-207

Seixas, P. (2017). A model of historical thinking. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 49:6, 593-605. doi:10.1080/00131857.2015.1101363

Virta, A. & Kouki, E. (2014). Dimensions of historical empathy in upper secondary students' essays. *Journal of humanities and social science education*, 2014:2, 137-160. Retrieved from https://www.kau.se/nordidactica

Wineburg, S. (1999). Historical thinking and other unnatural acts. *Phil delta kappa*, 80:7, 488-499. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/20439490

Wineburg, S. (2006). Historical thinking is unnatural, and immensely important: an interview with Sam Wineburg. *Historically speaking*, 7:3, 39-42. doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/hsp.2006.0093

Wineburg, S. (2007). Unnatural and essential: the nature of historical thinking. *Teaching history*, 129, 6-11. Retrieved from https://www.stor.org/stable/43259304

Yilmaz, K. (2007). Historical empathy and its implications for classroom practices in schools. *The history teacher*, 40:3, 331-337. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036827