

The Quebec History and Citizenship Education Curriculum and the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking (BHT): Convergence and Divergence

David Lefrancois and Stephanie Demers

The Quebec Education Program (QEP) makes up the core curriculum for elementary and secondary school students. It is divided according to levels (elementary and secondary), then according to cycles. Consequently, there is one elementary curriculum and two secondary curricula (one for the first cycle – grades seven and eight, known as secondary one and two, and another for the second cycle, grades nine through eleven, known as secondary three to five). In terms of structure and prescriptions, differences between the two secondary school curricula are minor. The only significant differences relate to content: the social phenomena which are studied change from one cycle to the next.

The QEP structures the aims, objects and content of the Quebec history program. The Benchmarks of Historical Thinking (BHT), on the other hand, are not part of a curriculum, but rather make up a series of key reference points for evaluating what students should be able to accomplish in learning history. Collectively, they represent structural, cognitive concepts of historical thinking. Examples of tasks centred on the Benchmarks concepts illustrate what to expect of students putting them into practice.

1. Conceptions of history and the purpose of teaching history

There exists some convergence in the aims put forth by the QEP and that of the BHT, particularly in regards to students building their identity and worldview, as well as in the development of skills or intellectual and critical competencies.

Where these two programs diverge is in the origins of their theoretical foundations. While the QEP is grounded in Quebec and French European theory and research, the BHT are based on American, British and English-Canadian theoreticians.

1.1. Constructing identity and worldview

Though the perspective of identity formation is not found in the Benchmarks' explanatory document¹, it can be found in the articles published before 2006, which serve as the basis for the BHT conceptual outline (Seixas & Peck, 2004, p. 110): "We need to know about the past to know who we are (individually and collectively) in any deep way." The structuring of one's identity, which is one of the three main educational aims of the QEP, is explicitly integrated into the Citizenship education component of the history program. The aim of Competency 3 is to have each student "*Strengthen his/her exercise of citizenship through the study of history,*" and as one of its key features desires each student to, "Seek the foundations of his/her social identity." The program states that:

“All students must develop a sense of who they are relative to other individuals characterized by numerous differences and must define themselves in relation to others, by relating to others. Taking otherness into account is thus an essential element of identity development. This process enables students to observe that the diversity of identities is not incompatible with the sharing of values, such as those related to democracy” (MELS, 2007, p. 22).

Constructing a worldview, which is the first general educational aim of the QEP, is reinvested in the History and Citizenship Education program, which in turn has the stated aim of giving students the tools to make sense of the world in which they live: “to help students to develop their understanding of the present in the light of the past” (MELS, 2007, p. 1). It is worth noting that this particular aim of the History and Citizenship Education program is also an integral part of the citizenship education component of the program, to which we will return. The idea of making sense of the world is also present in the foundational writings of the BHT (Seixas & Peck, 2004, p. 109-110): “The job of history education is to work with [the students’] fragments of thinking and develop them so that students have a better basis upon which to make sense of their own lives.”

1.2. Developing historical thinking

The QEP and the BHT both emphasize the development of intellectual and critical skills as one of the ultimate goals of learning history. To that end, the QEP explicitly rejects a traditional, transmissive approach to teaching:

“The purpose of teaching history at school is not to make students memorize a simplified, student-friendly version of the academic knowledge produced and constructed by historians, nor to ensure that they acquire factual learning of an encyclopedic nature, but rather to enable them to develop competencies that will help them to understand social phenomena of the present in the light of the past” (MELS, 2004, p. 295).

Seixas (2006, p. 1) expresses a similar position: “What should students know and be able to do when they are finished their years of school history? Surely the accumulation of facts-to-be-remembered is not an adequate answer to the question.”

What both approaches promote is the development of the intellectual and critical skills which serve as the basis of historical thought. According to the QEP:

“Learning history at school enables students to gradually acquire the attitudes, intellectual approach and language on which historical thinking is based. Examining social phenomena from a historical perspective involves formulating questions. To construct answers to their questions, students must employ the historians’ tools of reflection and use documentary sources” (MELS, 2004, p. 295).

For the authors of the BHT, the teaching of history should promote historical thinking and establish meaningful assessment criteria anchored in the various key components. It should also provide students with the skills necessary to critically analyze historical narratives (Seixas & Peck, 2004, p. 109).

1.3. Citizenship education

The aim of preparing citizens, clearly stated in the title of the History and Citizenship Education program, is not found in the BHT. The latter focus entirely on the development of historical thinking in order to provide teachers with practical tools and model tasks for teaching history and for assessing students' work. In this way, it transcends curricula.

Citizenship education is of considerable importance in the QEP and constitutes the core of its second general educational aim, which is to “prepare them to participate as informed citizens in the social life of a democratic, pluralistic society that is receptive to a complex world” (MELS, 2004, p. 295).

The curricular structure of the History and Citizenship Education program of the QEP demonstrates this preoccupation for the present by articulating in the object and/or situation of inquiry which serves the development of *Competency 1 – Examines social phenomena from a historical perspective*, and in the object of consciousness of citizenship which stands as a focal point for the development of *Competency 3 – Constructs his/her consciousness of citizenship*. History thus enables students to solve a problem related to a current social issue while engaging them in the debate surrounding it.

2. Units of study

The unit of study at the core of the History and Citizenship Education program is social phenomenon. According to the Ministry of Education: “The term ‘social phenomena’ refers to human action in societies of the past or the present. These phenomena encompass all aspects of the life of a society — the cultural, economic, political and territorial aspects — as well as the social aspect itself” (MELS, 2004, p. 295). Social phenomena identified as such usually refers to phenomena which constitute historical turning points or change which is inscribed in the long term and has far-reaching consequences still important today. As an object of study, the phenomenon is presented through a designated focus formulated as a potential historical problem which students need to define and solve in order to understand the present. The designated focus, according to the Program, “defines the framework within which the students are to develop their subject-specific competencies and ensures that they are not overwhelmed by uncontextualized details” (MELS, 2004, p. 308). Introduced in a short statement, the designated focus refers to the interaction between two phenomena, which need to be understood through history.

2.1. The QEP: understanding social phenomenon by turning to its historical origin

Social phenomena is first presented as it appears in its current state (object and/or situation of inquiry) which allows students to formulate questions pertaining to its origins and meaning in a historical perspective. Then with the help of the historical method, to examine these origins and build their interpretation of the phenomenon's genesis and consequences (object of interpretation). This diachronic process is followed by a synchronic examination and comparison of another society where elements of the same phenomenon are at play. Finally, students' understanding of contemporary issues arising from such phenomenon leads them to take a position in the social debate concerned with these issues (object of consciousness of citizenship).

The social phenomena are presented along with a conceptual framework with a single central concept supported by specific concepts, which are further detailed by the interpretative orientation given by the designated focus. According to the MELS (2007, p. 31) concepts form a large part of a society's shared cultural baggage and are, in their widest and most generalizable conception from a historical and social perspective, forms of knowledge specifically transferable to the study of other societies and phenomena. Furthermore, the MELS (2004, p. 320-321) states that "Strategies for teaching and learning concepts must enable students to move from preconceptions to functional, formal concepts" in order for them to develop "a fuller understanding of these concepts." This process is analogous to Bruner's spiral curriculum (Bruner, 1977/1960), as students first become familiar with concepts as tools for examining phenomena in the prescribed society¹ and consequently formulate a specific, contextualized and proximal understanding of concepts. They are then brought to widen their understanding to a transferable and generalizable definition by examining the same concepts in another society. Finally, the concepts are reinvested in the examination of the object of citizenship and in the arguments supporting the position students decide to take on the issue at hand.

Such a process, which navigates from the specific and proximal to the generalizable and transferable, is absent in the BHT, though some key concepts² are sometimes used to anchor the analysis of historical documents. In the case of the BHT, concepts are historical, that is to say, they are applied to the examination of the past without necessarily being also applied to understanding social phenomenon in the present. It should be noted, however, that some of the suggested tasks associated with the BHT require a preparatory stage where students' initial representation of a key concept used as a theme for the study of historical documents (immigration, for example) are made to emerge so that they may be confronted with other representations and build more comprehensive and accurate ones.

2.2. The BHT: events, trends and issues

¹ Each social phenomenon is studied as manifested in a prescribed society (democracy is studied in 5th century BCE Athens, industrialization in 18th century Britain, etc.). A comparative perspective is applied to the study of another society where elements of the same phenomenon are present. Three to four such societies are suggested but only one need be studied.

² Key concepts should not be confused with cognitive structural concepts, as the former are mental representations of objects of historical knowledge and the latter are representations of cognitive processes which structure historical thinking.

As previously stated, the BHT refer to structural cognitive concepts. These are not in any hierarchical or progressive order, though some concepts seem to logically precede others. Nonetheless, the concepts are not arranged according to any expectations as to the age at which students should master them or in which sequence they should do so.

Together, the BHT represent the epistemic cognitive procedures which, according to empirical research, compose historical thinking and what Seixas (2006) refers to as historical literacy. They require that students:

- Establish historical significance
- Use primary source evidence
- Identify continuity and change
- Analyze cause and consequence
- Take historical perspectives
- Understand the moral dimensions of history

Though no specific procedure or sequence of steps is prescribed by the BHT documents to develop historical thinking, there are resources such as model tasks which can be analyzed to better understand how students can reach the benchmarks.

These tasks formulate a historical problem based on a document, whether it be a picture, a written document or an artefact. The document acts as a witness to the past and it must be interpreted in order to solve the problem posed at the beginning of the task. It might represent an event or historical fact; a social, economic or political trend (which would be in Braudel's second level of historical time, neither long term nor event-based); or a historical issue which becomes an object of social debate. The study of the document gives students an opportunity to mobilize all the structural cognitive concepts which make up historical thinking in order to build their interpretation of what it represents and assess its meaning in light of its impact on the present.

While the QEP promotes the idea of ongoing movement between the past and the present — where the latter acts as both a starting point and a final destination and the former acts as a source for explaining social change through historical turning points (an approach which may be explained by the program's emphasis on citizenship education) — the BHT instead propose that students study documents which are representative of historical phenomenon in order to develop their own interpretation of it and evaluate its importance today. Developing historical thinking remains the main aim of the BHT, which do not include explicit goals of citizenship education, though it may be argued that establishing historical significance and understanding the moral dimensions of history are structural concepts which serve the very purpose of educating critical, thoughtful citizens. These two concepts relate to the meaning one can give to current remnants or traces of the past in order to guide our representation of the present and our actions in the future (Rüsen, 2004). The idea of questioning how moral dimensions of the present act upon our interpretation of the past and of the sources and actors who lived in past circumstances, with different moral parameters, allows students to question the present as well and to take a position regarding issues whose historicity has become available to

them.

Comparing the foundations of the History and Citizenship Education program of the Quebec Education Program (QEP) and the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking (BHT)

Elements of comparison	QEP	Benchmarks
AIM	To develop historical thinking to foster citizenship education	To develop historical thinking
UNIT OF STUDY	Social phenomena presented diachronically, concepts	Events, trends, historical issues
STARTING POINT	The present through a designated focus revealing the interaction between two phenomenon which needs to be questioned and explained	A trace of the past, which needs to be interpreted to make sense of the present

3. Examining domain-specific competencies of the QEP through the lens of the BHT

In order to better grasp what elements are common to both programs, and which differ, it is best to start from the domain-specific competencies which make up the core of the History and Citizenship Education program of the QEP — as they are very detailed and their scope reaches beyond the framework of historical thinking — and explore them in light of the key features of the BHT.

3.1. Common elements

As the QEP and the BHT share the aim of developing the intellectual and critical skills which constitute the foundation of historical thinking, they share many key features. These common elements are presented in the table which follows this section (Summary of elements common to both the QEP – cycle one – and the BHT).

The preoccupation with what Wineburg (2001) identifies as contextualization, which is the study of historical phenomena, actors and actions in their context, is presented in the BHT as the concept “Take historical perspectives.” This structural concept refers to the capacity to adopt the perspective of historical actors (from inferences based on historical sources) while avoiding presentism (the attribution of present beliefs and ideas to historical contexts) to understand there exists multiple interpretations for one phenomenon and that this multiplication of viewpoints for the same object is key to our understanding of historical phenomenon. The same concern for contextualisation is found in the QEP, in *Competency 1 – Examines social phenomena from a historical*

perspective, which requires that students turn to the past to understand the origins of current social phenomena. Hence, according to the MELS (2004, p. 302) students who question the origins of social phenomena “realize that in order to understand them, they must examine them from different angles, and question their existing perceptions of them.” They must also question the context from different angles, including that of beliefs and attitudes anchored in the historical period they are studying. Using the historical method (*Competency 2 – Interprets social phenomena using the historical method*), students explain the past manifestation of the social phenomenon studied, considering multiple aspects of contexts derived from source material.

The second feature shared by the QEP and the BHT relates to the goal of establishing the present significance and relevance of social phenomena and its study. The structural concept “Establishing historical significance” in the BHT allows students to situate the object of study in the long-term (what Braudel refers to as “temps long” of historical time), as historical change with important consequences throughout the remainder of history or as an essential source for explaining current social situations. This relation between the past and the present (and conversely, the present and the past) is also evident in the QEP, which proposes objects of study which constitute obvious historical breaks, such as the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain or the 1836-37 Rebellions in Lower Canada. Students need to consider these changes (social phenomena, in the QEP) as they impact society in the short, medium and long-term and to be conscious of what evidence is left of these changes in the present (particularly through the development of *Competency 1 – Examines social phenomena from a historical perspective*).

“Identifying continuity and change” over time is another element shared by the QEP and the Benchmarks. For the latter, this means that changes are inscribed in the long-term and that some aspect of life change faster than others. Historical turning points allow students to locate change while the concepts of progress and decline give them the possibility of “evaluating change over time” (Seixas, 2006, p. 6). Chronology and periodization are also tools which serve to organize our interpretation of continuity and change. These notions are also manifest in the QEP, though the concepts of progress and decline are never referred to as such and do not constitute a focus of study. In both the QEP and the BHT, however, students need to understand how and why some social phenomena or trends persist over time while others change. They are also required to set continuity and change in a historical framework, using chronological reference points (*Competency 1 – Examines social phenomena from a historical perspective*).

Like the QEP, the Benchmarks mobilize students’ ability to “Analyze cause and consequence” of historical phenomena. The BHT explicitly focus more on the exploration of causes, while the QEP refers to explanatory factors and consequences over time (*Competency 2 – Interprets social phenomena using the historical method*). This last element is less obviously present in the BHT. In addition, the Benchmarks’ concern for human agency in social change at the historical level becomes an element of citizenship education in the QEP (*Competency 3 – Constructs his/her consciousness of citizenship*). Exploring obstacles and limiting factors to human action is also a feature shared by both approaches, though the BHT set this part of the interpretation process in

the past while the QEP sets it firmly in the present, within a framework for developing power of agency.

The last feature explicitly shared by the QEP and the Benchmarks relates to understanding the moral dimension of history. The BHT refers to this structural concept as the moral nature of historical interpretation and narrative, which involve explicit or implicit moral judgments. They warn against making these anachronistic and imposing current moral standards to the analysis of actions, interests and motivations of historical actors. Historians must problematize historical questions with moral dimensions by suspending their own moral reference points in order to better understand the perspectives of historical actors and the current moral implications of their narratives and interpretations. This structural concept is also found in the QEP — in varying degrees — in all three competencies. By turning to the past (competency 1) students need to take historical actors' beliefs and values into account in order to understand their perspective. They are also expected to put their interpretations into perspective by being able to recognize and be conscious of their own moral representations and references (including beliefs and values) and of authors' frames of reference. That is to say, be aware of elements which contextualize the motives, interests and actions of historical actors in a historical perspective. Finally, as is the case with the QEP, students are expected to evaluate the impact of social phenomena on the present in terms of values and principles, but only in regards to democratic life (without referring to other dimensions of society). The critical stance the BHT encourage students to take on the moral implications of their interpretation is absent from the QEP.

Both programs call for interpretation based on source evidence. Nonetheless, there is marked difference in the nature of the sources favored by each. While the BHT take an explicit stand in favor of primary sources, the QEP is somewhat silent on the issue of the nature of documents to be studied and the origins of evidence, referring only to "sources" and "documents". In that regard, working with source evidence is less of a shared feature (though both programs refer to it) than one of the important differences between the QEP and the BHT.

Summary table of shared features of the QEP (History and Citizenship Education, cycle one) and the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking (BHT)

Benchmarks ³	<i>Competency 1 – Examines social phenomena from a historical perspective</i>	<i>Competency 2 – Interprets social phenomena using the historical method</i>	<i>Competency 3 – Constructs his/her consciousness of citizenship</i>
<p>ESTABLISH HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE</p> <p>Demonstrate how an event, person or development is significant either by showing it is embedded in a larger, meaningful narrative or by showing how it sheds light on an enduring or emerging issue</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Considers social phenomena in term of duration</p> <p>Is attentive to traces in the present of social phenomena of the past</p> <p>Expected outcomes:</p> <p>Uses historical perspective by referring to the present</p> <p>Raises relevant questions by taking into account the object and/or situation of inquiry concerning the social phenomenon</p>	<p>Expected outcome:</p> <p>Takes perspective into consideration by establishing a link between past and present</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Seeks the foundations of his/her social identity</p> <p>Makes connections between aspects of his/her identity and their origins</p>
<p>USING PRIMARY SOURCE EVIDENCE</p> <p>Use several primary sources to construct an original account of a historical event</p>	<p>Expected outcome:</p> <p>Examines social phenomena in depth by demonstrating critical judgment with regard to sources and interpretations</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Establishes the factual basis of social phenomena</p> <p>Finds information on various aspects of the facts</p> <p>Selects relevant documents</p> <p>Puts his/her interpretation of social phenomena in perspective</p> <p>Takes into account his/her own representations and the frame of reference of the authors consulted</p>	

³ Seixas, P. (2006). *Benchmarks of Historical Thinking: a Framework for Assessment in Canada*. Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness, UBC.

		<p>Expected outcome:</p> <p>Uses rigorous historical reasoning by basing his/her argument on a critical analysis of the sources</p> <p>Takes perspective into consideration by taking into account the need to critique the frame of reference of authors cited as sources</p>	
<p>IDENTIFY CONTINUITY AND CHANGE</p> <p>Explain how some things continue and others change, in any period of history</p> <p>Identify changes over time in aspects of life that we ordinarily assume to be continuous and to identify continuities in aspects of life we ordinarily assume to have changed over time</p> <p>Understand that periodization and judgments of progress and decline can vary depending on purpose and perspective</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Considers social phenomena in term of duration</p> <p>Reflects on social phenomena using chronological reference points (chronology, periodization, precedence, posteriority, synchrony)</p> <p>Looks for elements of continuity and change</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Establishes the factual basis of social phenomena</p> <p>Establishes the spatiotemporal framework</p>	
<p>ANALYZE CAUSE AND CONSEQUENCE</p> <p>Identify the interplay of intentional human action, and constraints on human actions in causing change</p> <p>Identify various types of causes for a particular event, using one or more accounts of the event</p> <p>Be able to construct counterfactuals</p>	<p>Expected outcome:</p> <p>Raises relevant questions by focusing on the facts, actors, actions, causes and consequences associated with the social phenomena studied</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Explains social phenomena</p> <p>Identifies enduring consequences</p>	

<p>TAKE A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE</p> <p>Recognize presentism in historical accounts</p> <p>Use evidence and understanding of the historical context, to answer questions of why people acted the way they did (or thought what they did) even when their actions seem at first irrational or inexplicable or different from what we would have done or thought</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Contemplates the past of social phenomena</p> <p>Finds out about the context of the period</p> <p>Shows a concern for the beliefs, attitudes and values of the period</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Establishes the factual basis of social phenomena</p> <p>Establishes the spatiotemporal framework</p> <p>Identifies the circumstances and actions</p>	
<p>UNDERSTAND THE MORAL DIMENSION IN HISTORY</p> <p>Make judgments about actions of people in the past, recognizing the historical context in which they were operating</p> <p>Use historical narratives to inform judgments about moral and policy questions in the present</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Contemplates the past of social phenomena</p> <p>Shows a concern for the beliefs, attitudes and values of the period</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Puts his/her interpretation of social phenomena in perspective</p> <p>Takes into account his/her own representations and the frame of reference of the authors consulted</p> <p>Expected outcome:</p> <p>Takes perspective into consideration by qualifying his/her interpretation</p>	<p>Key features:</p> <p>Establishes the contribution of social phenomena to democratic life</p> <p>Identifies values and principles that are based on social phenomena</p>

3.2. Differences between the QEP and the BHT

While the QEP and the BHT share a number of features — whether they be cognitive processes which constitute historical thinking or expected outcomes — the fact that their goals are not the same gives rise to a number of important differences. These are examined further in what follows.

3.2.1. Citizenship education

The QEP, as was pointed out before, differs from the BHT as it is a formal curriculum which officially establishes the compulsory parameters for teaching history and citizenship education in Quebec. As such, it must fulfill the mandate conferred to it by the state and society and insure the attainment of the ultimate aim of school, which is to educate citizens. The BHT, on the other hand, provide teachers with definitions of historical thinking structural concepts which should be used to inform student

assessment. The focus of the Benchmarks is the development of historical thinking and, as such, display far less concern for the present, which serves in the QEP to guide the learning of history for the purpose of citizenship education.

3.2.2. Source evidence

The QEP vaguely refers to the nature of sources and documents to be used by students to interpret social phenomena, while the BHT explicitly draw on the study of primary source documents, the context of their production, interests, motives, beliefs and values of the authors, as well as the critical stance students must adopt toward their own judgments. The QEP expects that students qualify their interpretation in light of their own social representations and authors' frames of reference, without referring to the necessary confrontation of sources — what Wineburg (2001) refers to as “corroboration” — which is explicitly present in the BHT. The QEP also does not mention primary sources.

3.2.3. Critical stance

The attention given to the subjective and interpretative nature of history and historical narratives as human construction is markedly greater in the Benchmarks than it is in the Quebec curriculum. While the latter expects that students will adopt a critical position toward sources and take authors' frames of reference into account, it does not refer to the nature of historical interpretation, to biases (be they ideological or cultural, etc.), or to authors' perspectives and what Wineburg (2001) identifies as corroboration and sourcing, through which historians identify and evaluate the source and confront one source with another. The BHT do include a structural concept focused on using primary source evidence, a concept which includes the analysis of authors' intentions, values and worldview, as well as the confrontation of various sources and perspectives. In addition, the critical analysis of authors' perspectives can be found in the benchmark known as “Identify continuity and change,” particularly in recognizing the way that authors' perspectives impact how they evaluate progress and decline. It is even recommended that students explore differences in how the interpretation of social phenomena has changed over time, particularly when current interpretations are compared to those of the past.

3.2.4. Importance of historical knowledge

Historical knowledge — in the form of domain-specific content — in the QEP is most often compulsory and includes cultural references selected because they are representative of the phenomenon studied or because of their lasting impact over time, as well as concepts (general, specific and sometimes historical) which are likely to help students solve the historical problem posed by the designated focus statement. The central and specific concepts, together with the designated focus, orient which historical knowledge is selected for compulsory study.

The BHT do not refer to compulsory knowledge, possibly because they are meant to be transposed to any history curriculum in Canada (or elsewhere). They thus need to be

adapted to specific contexts. In any case, one may conclude from the documents associated with the Benchmarks that their aim is the development of the intellectual and critical skills and concepts of historical thinking.

3.2.5. Comparison

The QEP is somewhat inspired by socio-constructivism and favors an understanding of learning as a three stage process, the first of which is preparation — which includes activities which promote the emergence of students' initial representations of a social phenomenon and a central concept, the exploration of the object of inquiry, and problematization. The second stage of the learning process promoted by the QEP is the active learning phase — which includes all activities related to solving the problem inherent to the designated focus. The last stage is integration and transfer — which includes a return to current manifestations of the social phenomenon being studied, inviting students to take a position on an object of citizenship, as well as the transfer of concepts to a society identified as a basis for comparing how such phenomena might have similar or different impacts in different contexts. This stage of comparison and transfer is not found in the BHT, which considers the phenomenon being studied only in light of the social context initially identified.

4. Conclusion

The analysis of the QEP's History and Citizenship Education curriculum (MELS, 2006) and the Benchmarks of Historical Thinking (Seixas, 2006) allows for identifying an important number of shared features, especially those connected with historical perspective and the historical method associated with historical thinking. The nature and mandate of the two programs being clearly different do however lead to some important distinctions, particularly in regards to the impact of curricular aims on the conception of what history education needs to be in the QEP. The curriculum's focus with citizenship education leads to a wider definition of the aims of learning history than what is explicitly presented in the BHT. One can nonetheless recognize a greater concern for critical skills and epistemic procedures of historical thinking in the BHT, particularly in regard to source evidence.

References

Bruner, J. (1977/1960). *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2004). *Quebec Education Program. Secondary School Education. Cycle One*. Québec: Gouvernement du Québec.

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (2007). *Quebec Education Program. Secondary School Education. Cycle Two*. Québec: Gouvernement du Québec.

Rüsen, J. (2004). Historical consciousness: narrative structure, moral function, and ontogenetic development. In P. Seixas (ed.), *Theorizing Historical Consciousness* (p. 63-85). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, P. & Peck, C. (2004). Teaching historical thinking. In A. Sears & I Wright (eds.), *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies* (p. 109-117). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Seixas, P. (2006). *Benchmarks of Historical Thinking: A Framework for Assessment in Canada*. Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness, UBC.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Authors

Stéphanie Demers is a doctoral candidate at the Université du Québec en Outaouais.

David Lefrançois earned a Ph.D. from the Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières in philosophy. He is a professor at the Department of Education in the Université du Québec en Outaouais. He is also a researcher in the GRECEH (Groupe de recherche sur la citoyenneté et l'enseignement de l'histoire).

Primary Contact Information

David LEFRANÇOIS, Département des sciences de l'éducation, Université du Québec en Outaouais, 283, boul. Alexandre-Taché, C.P. 1250, succursale Hull, Gatineau (Québec), Canada, J8X 3X7; **Phone:** 1 (819) 595-3900 (# 4425); **Email:** david.lefrancois@uqo.ca.