

- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

Account

Dashboard

Courses

Groups

Calendar

Inbox

History

Studio

A word on facts, evidence, hypotheses, and sources

As we begin our discussion of the raw materials of history, our sources, I want you to think back to the materials on thinking historically. (If you did not read them then, or cannot remember, go back and do so now - before proceeding).

History is a discipline that uses **fact-based inquiry** and formulates **hypotheses**. Critical thinking is part and parcel to everything we do as historians and students of history. Simply memorizing lists of people and events is not history. Historians want to explain why things happened; how things happened; and even why they happened the way they did and not some other way. It takes a lot of training to become an academic (or professional) historian, but every one of you can hone your analytical skills and start to look at facts and evidence with a more critical eye to understand larger trends and contexts (remember the 5 Cs?). [This is a marketable skill.](#) Many companies seek out undergraduate history majors because they have proven critical thinking and analysis skills. In this course, I will teach you the basics of these skills and start you off on the path to be a junior historian.

Before discussing the various types of sources and evidence available to us, I want you to [skim read \(a quick perusal to pick up the key points, the gist of the material\) this excerpt \(click here\)](#)

on a murder in the Pyrenees in 1301. It is by John H. Arnold and taken from his book, *History: A Very Short Introduction*. In this excerpt, he lays out the historian's craft and where sources of information can lead us and the types of information we can ask of our evidence.

There are two types of sources that historians use, primary sources and secondary sources.

Primary Sources are documents and other items that are created at the time under study. So the inquisition registers mentioned in the Arnold piece are primary sources. A newscast from 1969 reporting on the reaction to Neil Armstrong walking on the moon is a primary source for the study NASA's impact on American society. A law passed by the British Parliament ending slavery is a primary document. A diary of a British traveler in the American West is a primary document. A letter between a soldier and a loved one at home is a primary document. A piece of artwork produced in the 1700s or other material artifacts of the past are primary sources. So the key is that **anything**

- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

A word on facts, evidence, hypotheses, and sources

As we begin our discussion of the raw materials of history, our sources, I want you to think back to the materials on thinking historically. (If you did not read them then, or cannot remember, go back and do so now - before proceeding).

History is a discipline that uses **fact-based inquiry** and formulates **hypotheses**. Critical thinking is part and parcel to everything we do as historians and students of history. Simply memorizing lists of people and events is not history. Historians want to explain why things happened; how things happened; and even why they happened the way they did and not some other way. It takes a lot of training to become an academic (or professional) historian, but every one of you can hone your analytical skills and start to look at facts and evidence with a more critical eye to understand larger trends and contexts (remember the 5 Cs?). [This is a marketable skill.](#) Many companies seek out undergraduate history majors because they have proven critical thinking and analysis skills. In this course, I will teach you the basics of these skills and start you off on the path to be a junior historian.

Before discussing the various types of sources and evidence available to us, I want you to [skim read \(a quick perusal to pick up the key points, the gist of the material\) this excerpt \(click here\)](#)

on a murder in the Pyrenees in 1301. It is by John H. Arnold and taken from his book, *History: A Very Short Introduction*. In this excerpt, he lays out the historian's craft and where sources of information can lead us and the types of information we can ask of our evidence.

There are two types of sources that historians use, primary sources and secondary sources.

Primary Sources are documents and other items that are created at the time under study. So the inquisition registers mentioned in the Arnold piece are primary sources. A newscast from 1969 reporting on the reaction to Neil Armstrong walking on the moon is a primary source for the study NASA's impact on American society. A law passed by the British Parliament ending slavery is a primary document. A diary of a British traveler in the American West is a primary document. A letter between a soldier and a loved one at home is a primary document. A piece of artwork produced in the 1700s or other material artifacts of the past are primary sources. So the key is that **anything**

- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

- Account
- Dashboa rd
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

A word on facts, evidence, hypotheses, and sources

As we begin our discussion of the raw materials of history, our sources, I want you to think back to the materials on thinking historically. (If you did not read them then, or cannot remember, go back and do so now - before proceeding).

History is a discipline that uses **fact-based inquiry** and formulates **hypotheses**. Critical thinking is part and parcel to everything we do as historians and students of history. Simply memorizing lists of people and events is not history. Historians want to explain why things happened; how things happened; and even why they happened the way they did and not some other way. It takes a lot of training to become an academic (or professional) historian, but every one of you can hone your analytical skills and start to look at facts and evidence with a more critical eye to understand larger trends and contexts (remember the 5 Cs?). [This is a marketable skill.](#) Many companies seek out undergraduate history majors because they have proven critical thinking and analysis skills. In this course, I will teach you the basics of these skills and start you off on the path to be a junior historian.

Before discussing the various types of sources and evidence available to us, I want you to [skim read \(a quick perusal to pick up the key points, the gist of the material\) this excerpt \(click here\)](#)

on a murder in the Pyrenees in 1301. It is by John H. Arnold and taken from his book, *History: A Very Short Introduction*. In this excerpt, he lays out the historian's craft and where sources of information can lead us and the types of information we can ask of our evidence.

There are two types of sources that historians use, primary sources and secondary sources.

Primary Sources are documents and other items that are created at the time under study. So the inquisition registers mentioned in the Arnold piece are primary sources. A newscast from 1969 reporting on the reaction to Neil Armstrong walking on the moon is a primary source for the study NASA's impact on American society. A law passed by the British Parliament ending slavery is a primary document. A diary of a British traveler in the American West is a primary document. A letter between a soldier and a loved one at home is a primary document. A piece of artwork produced in the 1700s or other material artifacts of the past are primary sources. So the key is that **anything**

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

Primary Sources are documents and other items that are created at the time under study. So the inquisition registers mentioned in the Arnold piece are primary sources. A newscast from 1969 reporting on the reaction to Neil Armstrong walking on the moon is a primary source for the study NASA's impact on American society. A law passed by the British Parliament ending slavery is a primary document. A diary of a British traveler in the American West is a primary document. A letter between a soldier and a loved one at home is a primary document. A piece of artwork produced in the 1700s or other material artifacts of the past are primary sources. So the key is that **anything produced at the time under study** can be a primary source.

Once you understand the definition of a primary source, secondary sources are easy to understand. **A secondary source is anything produced at a later date about the time under study.** So all books by historians are secondary sources, documentaries about past events are secondary sources.

The tricky part is understanding that some secondary sources may contain primary sources. For example, if someone compiles a set of documents, annotates the documents, and provides an introductory essay about the collection we have a mixed set of sources. The documents themselves are primary and we need to give credit to the original author from the time under study. The annotations and introductory essay by the compiler (or editor, or translator) is secondary. **You must never confuse an editor, compiler, or translator with the author of the original work from the historical past.**

Historians base the majority of their original work on primary sources. But we don't discount what other academics/historians have said. We don't have to reinvent the wheel each time we look at a particular era. Therefore historians always provide their sources for others to use, like a breadcrumb trail, to follow their analysis, to verify their facts and evidence, and to engage in historical debate over the whys and hows and so whats of the past. When I get a new academic book by a historian, I will often read the footnotes or endnotes before reading the content, since it is through the sources and notes that historians engage with each other and peer review the interpretations of other historians.

It is perfectly acceptable to utilize the interpretations of another historian in your own work as long as you give the first historian full credit (**citation**) and you use your own words when you work the ideas into your own analysis. In this way you are being influenced by past historians but are adding new interpretations and analysis to his/her work. You do not merely regurgitate (paraphrase) because you have

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox (177)
- History
- Studio

Primary Sources are documents and other items that are created at the time under study. So the inquisition registers mentioned in the Arnold piece are primary sources. A newscast from 1969 reporting on the reaction to Neil Armstrong walking on the moon is a primary source for the study NASA's impact on American society. A law passed by the British Parliament ending slavery is a primary document. A diary of a British traveler in the American West is a primary document. A letter between a soldier and a loved one at home is a primary document. A piece of artwork produced in the 1700s or other material artifacts of the past are primary sources. So the key is that **anything produced at the time under study** can be a primary source.

Once you understand the definition of a primary source, secondary sources are easy to understand. **A secondary source is anything produced at a later date about the time under study.** So all books by historians are secondary sources, documentaries about past events are secondary sources.

The tricky part is understanding that some secondary sources may contain primary sources. For example, if someone compiles a set of documents, annotates the documents, and provides an introductory essay about the collection we have a mixed set of sources. The documents themselves are primary and we need to give credit to the original author from the time under study. The annotations and introductory essay by the compiler (or editor, or translator) is secondary. **You must never confuse an editor, compiler, or translator with the author of the original work from the historical past.**

Historians base the majority of their original work on primary sources. But we don't discount what other academics/historians have said. We don't have to reinvent the wheel each time we look at a particular era. Therefore historians always provide their sources for others to use, like a breadcrumb trail, to follow their analysis, to verify their facts and evidence, and to engage in historical debate over the whys and hows and so whats of the past. When I get a new academic book by a historian, I will often read the footnotes or endnotes before reading the content, since it is through the sources and notes that historians engage with each other and peer review the interpretations of other historians.

It is perfectly acceptable to utilize the interpretations of another historian in your own work as long as you give the first historian full credit (**citation**) and you use your own words when you work the ideas into your own analysis. In this way you are being influenced by past historians but are adding new interpretations and analysis to his/her work. You do not merely regurgitate (paraphrase) because you have

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox (177)
- History
- Studio

Primary Sources are documents and other items that are created at the time under study. So the inquisition registers mentioned in the Arnold piece are primary sources. A newscast from 1969 reporting on the reaction to Neil Armstrong walking on the moon is a primary source for the study NASA's impact on American society. A law passed by the British Parliament ending slavery is a primary document. A diary of a British traveler in the American West is a primary document. A letter between a soldier and a loved one at home is a primary document. A piece of artwork produced in the 1700s or other material artifacts of the past are primary sources. So the key is that **anything produced at the time under study** can be a primary source.

Once you understand the definition of a primary source, secondary sources are easy to understand. **A secondary source is anything produced at a later date about the time under study.** So all books by historians are secondary sources, documentaries about past events are secondary sources.

The tricky part is understanding that some secondary sources may contain primary sources. For example, if someone compiles a set of documents, annotates the documents, and provides an introductory essay about the collection we have a mixed set of sources. The documents themselves are primary and we need to give credit to the original author from the time under study. The annotations and introductory essay by the compiler (or editor, or translator) is secondary. **You must never confuse an editor, compiler, or translator with the author of the original work from the historical past.**

Historians base the majority of their original work on primary sources. But we don't discount what other academics/historians have said. We don't have to reinvent the wheel each time we look at a particular era. Therefore historians always provide their sources for others to use, like a breadcrumb trail, to follow their analysis, to verify their facts and evidence, and to engage in historical debate over the whys and hows and so whats of the past. When I get a new academic book by a historian, I will often read the footnotes or endnotes before reading the content, since it is through the sources and notes that historians engage with each other and peer review the interpretations of other historians.

It is perfectly acceptable to utilize the interpretations of another historian in your own work as long as you give the first historian full credit (**citation**) and you use your own words when you work the ideas into your own analysis. In this way you are being influenced by past historians but are adding new interpretations and analysis to his/her work. You do not merely regurgitate (paraphrase) because you have

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox (177)
- History
- Studio

Historians base the majority of their original work on primary sources. But we don't discount what other academics/historians have said. We don't have to reinvent the wheel each time we look at a particular era. Therefore historians always provide their sources for others to use, like a breadcrumb trail, to follow their analysis, to verify their facts and evidence, and to engage in historical debate over the whys and hows and so whats of the past. When I get a new academic book by a historian, I will often read the footnotes or endnotes before reading the content, since it is through the sources and notes that historians engage with each other and peer review the interpretations of other historians.

It is perfectly acceptable to utilize the interpretations of another historian in your own work as long as you give the first historian full credit (**citation**) and you use your own words when you work the ideas into your own analysis. In this way you are being influenced by past historians but are adding new interpretations and analysis to his/her work. You do not merely regurgitate (paraphrase) because you have added no original analysis. But secondary sources should not form the bulk of any analysis.

Peer-review is key to history. All works by academic historians are reviewed by peers and the comments can be brutal. Before a journal article or monograph is published, the draft has gone through at least one round, and likely more, of peer review. Other historians specializing in the same narrow field review to make sure that the analysis is supported by facts, appropriate evidence and sources, and that there are no glaring faults in logic or presentation of argument. It is not opinion, only the results of fact-based inquiry get published. Which is not to say that all historians always agree on everything. We don't. But we respect fact-based and logical arguments that do not leave out key pieces of evidence. Historians then argue (and boy, do we love to argue) about differing interpretations of events. Over time a synthesis develops, things all historians can agree on about a particular event or interpretation. These syntheses will become your textbooks. I might have a disagreement here or there about something in a text, but I generally agree with most American history texts.

So, in summary, **when you write a piece of historical analysis in this class, it needs to be based on evidence and primary sources.** You can pull ideas, properly cited, from secondary sources in creating your own original analysis.

◀ Previous

Next ▶

Navigation sidebar with icons and labels: Account, Dashboard, Courses, Groups, Calendar, Inbox (177), History, Studio

Historians base the majority of their original work on primary sources. But we don't discount what other academics/historians have said. We don't have to reinvent the wheel each time we look at a particular era. Therefore historians always provide their sources for others to use, like a breadcrumb trail, to follow their analysis, to verify their facts and evidence, and to engage in historical debate over the whys and hows and so whats of the past. When I get a new academic book by a historian, I will often read the footnotes or endnotes before reading the content, since it is through the sources and notes that historians engage with each other and peer review the interpretations of other historians.

It is perfectly acceptable to utilize the interpretations of another historian in your own work as long as you give the first historian full credit (**citation**) and you use your own words when you work the ideas into your own analysis. In this way you are being influenced by past historians but are adding new interpretations and analysis to his/her work. You do not merely regurgitate (paraphrase) because you have added no original analysis. But secondary sources should not form the bulk of any analysis.

Peer-review is key to history. All works by academic historians are reviewed by peers and the comments can be brutal. Before a journal article or monograph is published, the draft has gone through at least one round, and likely more, of peer review. Other historians specializing in the same narrow field review to make sure that the analysis is supported by facts, appropriate evidence and sources, and that there are no glaring faults in logic or presentation of argument. It is not opinion, only the results of fact-based inquiry get published. Which is not to say that all historians always agree on everything. We don't. But we respect fact-based and logical arguments that do not leave out key pieces of evidence. Historians then argue (and boy, do we love to argue) about differing interpretations of events. Over time a synthesis develops, things all historians can agree on about a particular event or interpretation. These syntheses will become your textbooks. I might have a disagreement here or there about something in a text, but I generally agree with most American history texts.

So, in summary, **when you write a piece of historical analysis in this class, it needs to be based on evidence and primary sources.** You can pull ideas, properly cited, from secondary sources in creating your own original analysis.

◀ Previous

Next ▶

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox (177)
- History
- Studio

Historians base the majority of their original work on primary sources. But we don't discount what other academics/historians have said. We don't have to reinvent the wheel each time we look at a particular era. Therefore historians always provide their sources for others to use, like a breadcrumb trail, to follow their analysis, to verify their facts and evidence, and to engage in historical debate over the whys and hows and so whats of the past. When I get a new academic book by a historian, I will often read the footnotes or endnotes before reading the content, since it is through the sources and notes that historians engage with each other and peer review the interpretations of other historians.

It is perfectly acceptable to utilize the interpretations of another historian in your own work as long as you give the first historian full credit (**citation**) and you use your own words when you work the ideas into your own analysis. In this way you are being influenced by past historians but are adding new interpretations and analysis to his/her work. You do not merely regurgitate (paraphrase) because you have added no original analysis. But secondary sources should not form the bulk of any analysis.

Peer-review is key to history. All works by academic historians are reviewed by peers and the comments can be brutal. Before a journal article or monograph is published, the draft has gone through at least one round, and likely more, of peer review. Other historians specializing in the same narrow field review to make sure that the analysis is supported by facts, appropriate evidence and sources, and that there are no glaring faults in logic or presentation of argument. It is not opinion, only the results of fact-based inquiry get published. Which is not to say that all historians always agree on everything. We don't. But we respect fact-based and logical arguments that do not leave out key pieces of evidence. Historians then argue (and boy, do we love to argue) about differing interpretations of events. Over time a synthesis develops, things all historians can agree on about a particular event or interpretation. These syntheses will become your textbooks. I might have a disagreement here or there about something in a text, but I generally agree with most American history texts.

So, in summary, **when you write a piece of historical analysis in this class, it needs to be based on evidence and primary sources.** You can pull ideas, properly cited, from secondary sources in creating your own original analysis.

◀ Previous

Next ▶

- Home
- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

View All Pages

The importance of footnotes/endnotes

Attached you will find the endnotes for a chapter from a monograph (academic history book). *These are in Turabian/Chicago citation style - the only style appropriate in a history course.* Why, because historians mine each others' footnotes in a way many other disciplines do not and this style provides us with the information and clarity we need. Also look for the notes where the author is having a discussion with his/her fellow historians - sometimes about a source, or sometimes about a scholarly argument, or sometimes to provide more information that does not belong in the body of the work.

Skim through this file:

- [Endnote sample.pdf](#)

Can you tell what this chapter/book is about simply from looking at the notes? Can you pinpoint a time and place? Can you get a the general category (social, political, economic, religious, military, etc.)? Can you guess at a more specific topic for the chapter? Below, you will have an opportunity to guess.

Now why am I having you do this? For two reasons, first to show you how important it is to cite your work, the proper format for citation, and to show you the preponderance of evidence you need in good historical analysis. Second, to show you that footnotes/endnotes of an academic work are a great place to do research, to go and find the documents to read them for yourself and to use in your own research/work (the breadcrumbs that historians leave each other to follow).

◀ Previous

Next ▶

- Home
- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

View All Pages

The importance of footnotes/endnotes

Attached you will find the endnotes for a chapter from a monograph (academic history book). *These are in Turabian/Chicago citation style - the only style appropriate in a history course.* Why, because historians mine each others' footnotes in a way many other disciplines do not and this style provides us with the information and clarity we need. Also look for the notes where the author is having a discussion with his/her fellow historians - sometimes about a source, or sometimes about a scholarly argument, or sometimes to provide more information that does not belong in the body of the work.

Skim through this file:

- [Endnote sample.pdf](#)

Can you tell what this chapter/book is about simply from looking at the notes? Can you pinpoint a time and place? Can you get a the general category (social, political, economic, religious, military, etc.)? Can you guess at a more specific topic for the chapter? Below, you will have an opportunity to guess.

Now why am I having you do this? For two reasons, first to show you how important it is to cite your work, the proper format for citation, and to show you the preponderance of evidence you need in good historical analysis. Second, to show you that footnotes/endnotes of an academic work are a great place to do research, to go and find the documents to read them for yourself and to use in your own research/work (the breadcrumbs that historians leave each other to follow).

◀ Previous

Next ▶

Navigation sidebar with icons and labels: Account, Dashboard, Courses, Groups, Calendar, Inbox (177), History, Studio

2020 Fall

View All Pages

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

In this course....

You must cite your primary and secondary sources in this course.

1. Use **FOOTNOTES** (not Works Cited or Bibliography at end of assignment). Footnotes **MUST** provide page numbers, where applicable (you cannot cite your entire textbook, for example).
2. If you are citing a primary source document, you **MUST** provide the author information for that document.
3. You **MUST** use Turabian (Chicago) citation style.
4. Parenthetical citations **ARE NOT** permitted

UTA Library Libguide for History: Chicago Citation Style - <https://libguides.uta.edu/c.php?g=949809&p=6849573>

◀ Previous

Next ▶

Navigation sidebar with icons and labels: Account, Dashboard, Courses, Groups, Calendar, Inbox (177), History, Studio

2020 Fall

View All Pages

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

In this course....

You must cite your primary and secondary sources in this course.

1. Use **FOOTNOTES** (not Works Cited or Bibliography at end of assignment). Footnotes **MUST** provide page numbers, where applicable (you cannot cite your entire textbook, for example).
2. If you are citing a primary source document, you **MUST** provide the author information for that document.
3. You **MUST** use Turabian (Chicago) citation style.
4. Parenthetical citations **ARE NOT** permitted

UTA Library Libguide for History: Chicago Citation Style - <https://libguides.uta.edu/c.php?g=949809&p=6849573>

◀ Previous

Next ▶

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

2020 Fall

[View All Pages](#)

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

Guide to Citations ^{AD}

Since you will only use materials assigned to you in this course in your assignments, you can use a modified (simplified) version of Turabian Chicago citations in this course. Note that if you do choose to use something from outside this course, we expect a full Turabian/Chicago style citation (we do NOT recommend you do this and you may lose points on your assignment)

Your Textbook: *American Yawp*, Chapter #, Section #

Lecture Videos and Slides: UTA History Department, *Name of Lecture Video/Slide* in Unit #, Lesson #

Other Videos (not Lecture Videos or Lecture Slides): Producer Name (if available), *Name of Video* in Unit #, Lesson #

Other Secondary Source Reading: Author Name, "*Name of Reading*," page number (if available or section if available) in Unit #, Lesson #

Primary Source Reading found in *American Yawp*: Author of Document, "*Name of Document*" in *American Yawp*, Chapter #, Section #

Primary Source Reading posted or linked to in Module: Author of Document, "*Name of Document*" in Unit #, Lesson #

Website Link: Name of Website in Unit #, Lesson #

[◀ Previous](#)

[Next ▶](#)

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

2020 Fall

[View All Pages](#)

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

Guide to Citations ^{AD}

Since you will only use materials assigned to you in this course in your assignments, you can use a modified (simplified) version of Turabian Chicago citations in this course. Note that if you do choose to use something from outside this course, we expect a full Turabian/Chicago style citation (we do NOT recommend you do this and you may lose points on your assignment)

Your Textbook: *American Yawp*, Chapter #, Section #

Lecture Videos and Slides: UTA History Department, *Name of Lecture Video/Slide* in Unit #, Lesson #

Other Videos (not Lecture Videos or Lecture Slides): Producer Name (if available), *Name of Video* in Unit #, Lesson #

Other Secondary Source Reading: Author Name, "*Name of Reading*," page number (if available or section if available) in Unit #, Lesson #

Primary Source Reading found in *American Yawp*: Author of Document, "*Name of Document*" in *American Yawp*, Chapter #, Section #

Primary Source Reading posted or linked to in Module: Author of Document, "*Name of Document*" in Unit #, Lesson #

Website Link: Name of Website in Unit #, Lesson #

[◀ Previous](#)

[Next ▶](#)

2020 Fall

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

- Account
- Dashboa rd
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

View All Pages

HOW TO ANALYZE A PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENT



You will be answering these six questions in the worksheet below. For your convenience, [click here](#) for a downloadable copy of this list of questions.

1. *Who is the author of the document?*

In analyzing a primary source document, simply knowing the name of the person who wrote it is not enough, you also need to learn something about the author to understand his/her point of view and biases. Give the name of the author and provide a brief biographical comment. Please think about the definition of an author. Is an author someone who merely translates or edits a collection or the originator of the document in the historical past? Do not confuse editors and translators with authors.

2. *When was this document written? How long after the event was it written?*

Okay, sometimes this is obvious and sometimes it takes a bit of sleuthing and critical thinking skills to figure out. In this class you will find all the information you need to know to answer questions like these from the assigned materials. If someone writes about an event they were part of in their diary that same day, you will get fresh, first-hand account, but it will also lack perspective. If someone writes about an event in their memoirs later, you will have a fading of memory but the author will also have a better picture of the importance of an event and the impact it had on later events. Both are valid primary sources, but you have to use them differently.

2020 Fall

- Home
- Announcements
- Modules
- Piazza
- Assignments
- Syllabus
- Grades
- Files
- Pages**
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

- Account
- Dashboa rd
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

View All Pages

HOW TO ANALYZE A PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENT



You will be answering these six questions in the worksheet below. For your convenience, [click here](#) for a downloadable copy of this list of questions.

1. *Who is the author of the document?*

In analyzing a primary source document, simply knowing the name of the person who wrote it is not enough, you also need to learn something about the author to understand his/her point of view and biases. Give the name of the author and provide a brief biographical comment. Please think about the definition of an author. Is an author someone who merely translates or edits a collection or the originator of the document in the historical past? Do not confuse editors and translators with authors.

2. *When was this document written? How long after the event was it written?*

Okay, sometimes this is obvious and sometimes it takes a bit of sleuthing and critical thinking skills to figure out. In this class you will find all the information you need to know to answer questions like these from the assigned materials. If someone writes about an event they were part of in their diary that same day, you will get fresh, first-hand account, but it will also lack perspective. If someone writes about an event in their memoirs later, you will have a fading of memory but the author will also have a better picture of the importance of an event and the impact it had on later events. Both are valid primary sources, but you have to use them differently.

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

Here a brief (1-3 sentences) summary is needed.

4. Where does the action contained in this document take place? Is it important to the subject of the document? What is the relationship of the author to the action?

Asking this question of a document is very important as it speaks to the biases of the author and also as to the types of information the author should reasonably have. As you have seen in this course, historical geography is important. Does geography have any bearing in your document? Is the author present at the event?

5. Why did the author write this document? Who is his audience? What does he hope to gain from writing this document? What is his point of view?

All of these questions speak to the author's bias. Every time you write, you write for an audience (even if it is only for yourself). There is a purpose to writing. The author wants to gain something from writing; the historian's job is to understand the motivation behind the creation of document and the biases inherent within. Sometimes an author will modify what he/she is saying to impress a particular audience (or to get the audience to do something he/she wants) or to excuse their own actions. Understanding why the author will help you better use the document and interpret history.

6. Taking the above answers into account, how accurate do you find this document? What would be the drawbacks of using this document? What would this document help a historian to explain/analyze?

Historians ask questions like these (and more) of each and every primary source they use in interpreting the past. This is critical thinking. It is a skill that needs to be learned through practice, but can also be used to analyze almost any situation or source of information in life. Every document/source has its advantages and drawbacks; this is why historians never rely on only one document. Historians utilize multiple primary sources and multiple points of view when analyzing the past. History is not just one person's opinion; it is a careful reading and analysis of multiple perspectives to answer the questions of not only what, but why.

Navigation sidebar (blue background):
- Home icon (star in 'A')
- Account icon (person)
- Dashboard icon (gauge)
- Courses icon (book)
- Groups icon (two people)
- Calendar icon (calendar)
- Inbox icon (envelope with 177)
- History icon (clock)
- Studio icon (computer monitor)

Here a brief (1-3 sentences) summary is needed.

4. Where does the action contained in this document take place? Is it important to the subject of the document? What is the relationship of the author to the action?

Asking this question of a document is very important as it speaks to the biases of the author and also as to the types of information the author should reasonably have. As you have seen in this course, historical geography is important. Does geography have any bearing in your document? Is the author present at the event?

5. Why did the author write this document? Who is his audience? What does he hope to gain from writing this document? What is his point of view?

All of these questions speak to the author's bias. Every time you write, you write for an audience (even if it is only for yourself). There is a purpose to writing. The author wants to gain something from writing; the historian's job is to understand the motivation behind the creation of document and the biases inherent within. Sometimes an author will modify what he/she is saying to impress a particular audience (or to get the audience to do something he/she wants) or to excuse their own actions. Understanding why the author will help you better use the document and interpret history.

6. Taking the above answers into account, how accurate do you find this document? What would be the drawbacks of using this document? What would this document help a historian to explain/analyze?

Historians ask questions like these (and more) of each and every primary source they use in interpreting the past. This is critical thinking. It is a skill that needs to be learned through practice, but can also be used to analyze almost any situation or source of information in life. Every document/source has its advantages and drawbacks; this is why historians never rely on only one document. Historians utilize multiple primary sources and multiple points of view when analyzing the past. History is not just one person's opinion; it is a careful reading and analysis of multiple perspectives to answer the questions of not only what, but why.

- Account
- Dashboard
- Courses
- Groups
- Calendar
- Inbox
- History
- Studio

- Pages
- Quizzes
- Course Evaluations
- UTA Libraries
- People

In this exercise, you will learn about the building blocks of historical analysis: sources and evidence. As a reminder, there are two key types of sources:

Primary Sources are anything produced at the time of study. For example a transcript of a court case from 1805, a diary entry of First Lady Dolley Madison concerning the British invasion, a newsreel of the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, a letter between a labor organizer and the president of a company concerning negotiations over a labor agreement in 1937, a map showing the proposed route of a transcontinental railroad from 1856, a newspaper article from 1876 recounting the defeat of Gen. Custer at Little Big Horn, or even material evidence such as pottery from an Anasazi site, a nurse's uniform from WWI, or a Frank Lloyd Wright designed building from the mid-20th century.

Secondary Sources are anything produced *after* the time under study. A key example would be the Corbett textbook or any book by a historian.

Evidence is drawn from your sources, both primary and secondary, in support of an argument (thesis) you are making. For example, if I were to propose that Cheeseburgers are the best food for a meal I will need evidence to convince you of my argument. I might provide you with numbers derived from restaurant data that show cheeseburgers are the most ordered entree in the US for the past ten years (primary source), some facts from a book written about the ingredients of cheeseburgers (a secondary source), and results of a survey of people on the streets of downtown Dallas (primary source) in support of my argument.

In this course, you must back up every broad statement (cheeseburgers are best) with specific and detailed evidence (sales statistics, surveys, and ingredients) from both primary and secondary sources.

To organize your argument you will need a Rule of Three **Thesis Statement:** *Cheeseburgers are the best food for a meal since they lead restaurant sales, are popular with average Americans, and have wholesome ingredients.*

This thesis tells the reader the premise of the argument and where the argument is going (a road map of the essay). You will then follow up with your specific and detailed evidence and an explanation of how this evidence supports your argument. And since the thesis is a road map, you will need to discuss your evidence in the order in which it is presented in the thesis (restaurant data first, then surveys, then ingredients).

We require "Rule of Three" analytical writing in this course. In the folder below is more information on Rule of Three writing.

Signature Essay Prompt

PROMPT:

During the mid 18th Century, English colonists appealed to the metropole for redress of various grievances. In this essay, I want you to consider the ethics and civics of those seeking change (later known to us as the Patriots). Who were these Patriots? What methods did they use to further their goals through civic engagement? What ethical considerations did they take into account in seeking redress of their grievances? Did the new United States (under either the Articles or Constitution) address their grievances?

Note 1: Successful responses will consider a broad range of evidence in support of arguments. Take a few moments to consider how you would respond by making a list of both "ethics" and "civics" related to the colonists and their grievances. Be sure to have a mixture of big/broad ideas and specific/detailed evidence in your argument.

Note 2: We DO NOT want summaries. Summaries will not earn a high grade. "A papers" utilize rule of three analysis (including strong rule of three thesis statements in the introduction and each paragraph of the body), specific and detailed historical facts as evidence, analysis instead of summary, consider change over time and historical geography (as necessary in response to the prompt), and properly cite both primary and secondary sources.

Note 3: Required length is 2-3 pages (introduction, 3 paragraphs of the body, conclusion).

Requirements for the Signature Essay

- Must be in Rule of Three format with a introduction and strong thesis statement, 3 paragraphs of the body (each with their own thesis statement - one for each of the three key points of your overall thesis), and conclusion. So a minimum of 5 paragraphs. (2-3 pages)
- This is a fact based essay, you must provide specific and detailed evidence for your hypotheses.
- You must utilize a minimum of three primary sources from the assigned materials (primary sources posted in the course module OR found under the primary source section of each chapter in American Yawp only; you may not utilize sources linked to in the reference section of American Yawp) as evidence in your essay
- You must utilize a minimum of three secondary sources from the assigned materials as evidence in your essay
- You may only use materials assigned in this course for your essay (we have vetted all the materials utilized in this course, other materials may not be appropriate or accurate). If you use outside sources your grade will be docked.
- **DO NOT QUOTE sources, paraphrase in your own words and cite**
- You must consider ethics/ethical decision making in this essay
- Don't forget about historical geography, where something takes place matters and it may be important to your argument.
- You must use Turabian citation style in this essay; all citations must be footnote style citations (no parenthetical cites allowed, no endnotes/works cited at the end, you need footnotes). Be sure to review how to properly cite a primary source that may be contained in another work and be sure to use page numbers where possible.
- 12 pt type, 1 inch margins, double-spaced

[View All Pages](#)

NOTE ON CITATIONS

CITATIONS are REQUIRED for this essay. You will lose points for failure to cite or incorrect style of citations.

[◀ Previous](#)

[Next ▶](#)

RULE OF THREE THESES - Do you have a well thought out and clear overall thesis in your introduction? Do you have a thesis statement for each of your three paragraphs of the body? Do the paragraphs of the body follow the overall thesis statement?

EVIDENCE - You must have solid evidence for each point you raise in the thesis. Evidence is not simply a statement, there must be an explanation of how that evidence supports the thesis statement.

Example: If you were writing a paragraph on the causes of the Cold War, you might use the Baruch Plan as an example. Simply writing "the Baruch Plan was a cause of the Cold War" in your paragraph would not be enough and would not be analytical. However, the following sentences do provide a good analysis of this piece of evidence:

"One cause of the Cold War was the failure of the United States and the Soviet Union to agree upon a plan for nuclear disarmament after World War II. The Baruch Plan, presented by the US, would maintain the American atomic weapon advantage for the foreseeable future. This played into Stalin's suspicions of the Americans' true motivations toward the USSR."

Did you use the minimum number of primary sources? secondary sources?

HISTORICAL ACCURACY, CLARITY, AND LOGIC

Did you analyze (not summarize)? Is your argument clear and does it make sense? Is it historically accurate? Does your evidence prove your point? Does your analysis answer the prompt? Have you considered the concepts of ethics and civics, change over time, and any historical geography factors in your essay?

PROPER CITATION

Have you properly cited? Have you used Turabian/Chicago? You must also FOOTNOTE. Parenthetical cites are NOT allowed

PROPER CITATION

Have you properly cited? Have you used Turabian/Chicago? You must also FOOTNOTE. Parenthetical cites are NOT allowed.

GRAMMAR, SPELLING AND MECHANICS

Is the essay up to college standards for grammar and spelling? Is it an analytical essay? Does it meet minimum length and formatting requirements?

REVIEW YOUR HISTORICAL SKILLS EXERCISES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS ESSAY

[◀ Previous](#)

[Next ▶](#)