

Asking ‘How’ to Infuse Temporality into Upper Secondary Historical Inquiry

Lim Ying Xuan

*Chung Cheng High School (Yishun), Singapore**

**This article was written when the author was a student teacher at the National Institute of Education (NIE)*

Abstract

This article proposes the usage of ‘how’ questions to develop historical understandings and an appreciation of the historical process. ‘How’ inquiries elicit a temporal dimension that is necessary for historical understanding, especially bolstering the concept of chronology. This article contends that more thought should be put into the pairings of question forms with particularities of the past. Classroom inquiry should be further modelled on the approaches used by professional historians, pairing an often neglected ‘how’ dimension to the ‘why’ dimension that predominates current inquiries. Asking ‘how’ resists a ‘flattened’ form of history that inhibits understanding of second-order historical concepts, and prevents students from falling into rabbit holes of factorization and weighing that are acutely ahistorical and unnuanced. This article contends that students are already equipped with some of the necessary tools for teachers to use ‘how’ more often in classrooms. In the quest for greater historical understanding, asking the historical ‘how’ appears as the next practicable step to help students have a better glimpse into the historian’s craft.

Singapore as distinct from content-focused teaching. Constraints of time, assessment and departmental requirements have led to teachers eschewing one or the other. This tendency to segregate has been frustrating to curriculum planners, who stressed the importance of doing both together (MOE, 2012). Many teachers agree with researchers that these concepts are great tools for historical understanding, but hold reservations in the belief that they are scarcely helpful in preparing students for high-stakes national exams (Afandi & Baidon, 2010). When the concepts are integrated, there is often a pick-and-choose process. Concepts of chronology and accounts are often put by the wayside to focus on concepts of evidence and causation. Those that are difficult to examine are seen as luxuries to be jettisoned when push comes to shove. Furthermore, it is perceived to be much easier to conduct explicit second-order concept teaching in Lower Secondary, where content and exam pressures are softer. Upper Secondary teachers have remarked that their hands are tied. Many departments teach to help students easily wield content for exams, rather than for understanding of the historical process.

Introduction

The teaching of second-order concepts is often seen by history teachers in

This article will take a deeper look on the historicity and temporality of the questions are being asked in Upper Secondary historical inquiry. As the

'historicity' of inquiry heavily affects our ability to facilitate the acquisition of second-order concepts effectively, a framework asking 'How' questions can complement the already prevalent use of 'Why'. 'How' questions refer to questions that require students to elicit processes, for example, asking how Hitler rose to power and how World War II began. This contrasts with 'Why' questions that aim to elicit reasons, such as the factors that led Hitler to power. 'How' questions are already gradually taking center-stage in the Lower Secondary curriculum, with the new Secondary One textbook wielding them extensively as the inquiry focus of topics. I contend that this pairing allows for teaching of content and concepts symbiotically, by replicating the approaches used by professional historians in avoiding a 'flattening' of history. I argue that the use of "How" in both teaching and assessment will allow for the organic development of students' understanding of key second-order concepts, such as chronology. It will also engender an appreciation of the synthetic nature of historical knowledge. Bringing students through the 'How' and having them eventually account for the 'How' requires them to marshal content and disciplinary concepts in a way that helps students capture the temporality and nuance of the phenomena in discussion.

Inquiry Historicity

In recent years, history education has shifted to focus on historical inquiry and in second-order historical concepts (Afandi and Baildon, 2010). Inquiry is viewed as crucial in developing critical thinking, construction and communication skills, metacognitive processes and an appreciation for complexity (MOE, 2013). Concepts are the means move students beyond reconstruction of facts into knowledge through developing a sense of the past and an idea of how historical

knowledge is constructed (MOE, 2013).

Teachers in Singapore rely on the Upper Secondary Teaching and Learning Guide for guidance on inquiry-based teaching, which in turn derived its framework from works by Byron, Riley and Kitson. The guide suggests key inquiry questions for each topic and lays out parameters on inquiry (MOE, 2013). According to the guide, inquiry begins with setting a good inquiry question, which it defines as one that:

- a) Enables students to focus on a particular historical concept in the investigation of the question;
- b) Deals with an authentic phenomenon and issue that requires explanatory or evaluative responses;
- c) Is substantial enough to be developed over a series of lessons;
- d) Remains relevant to the syllabus and is pegged at the topic level; and
- e) Results in a substantial and enjoyable 'end product' through which students genuinely answer the inquiry question. (MOE, 2013)

These parameters are crucial in guiding teachers in verifying whether their questions are pedagogically viable: on whether it develops student's understanding of the syllabus and whether it furthers student's interest in the subject. However, these guidelines are primarily about how the questions asked can be more educational, not more historical (Riley, 2000; Gorman, 1998). Baring point (a), the above guideline can be transported to any discipline. The guidance on inquiry helps teachers marry question and pedagogy, but not question and discipline.

Teachers and textbook writers have thus used a range of inquiry question types that have not been thoroughly scrutinized for their historicity. This has, regrettably, led to

a preponderance of question forms that, while perfectly conforming to the requirements laid out by the guide and thoroughly suitable when viewed through educational lenses, struggle to elicit historical understanding in students who answer them. Granted, without deeply considering the historicity of questions, most of the questions that teachers use, such as those on the inevitability of a Japanese assault on China or the origins of Stalin's rise to power, are already historically legitimate questions that definitely have a place in the classroom, and are often used by professional historians themselves. But deeper thought will uncover some nuances of questioning often overlooked.

Take for example, the question 'Why did the Cold War end?', which appears as the final inquiry question in the textbook *Bi-Polarity and the Cold War* (Ling and Paul, 2014). The question looks inconspicuous, asking what sounds to be a perfectly legitimate question on the roots of 1989 and 1991. Teachers I had discussions with found this question easy to answer, because the 'factors' can easily be wielded to answer the question. However historically, the question form struggles to capture the essence of the topic being asked. Solely asking 'why' in this scenario appears problematic as the historical item behind the question, the 'end of the Cold War', is a process rather than a moment (Taubman, 2017; Alexievich, 2017). The end of the Cold War was not a 'big bang' moment but one of gradual chipping of Communism, from Solidarity, to Perestroika (which itself is a process and not an item) and then the Velvet Revolution, the Baltic Way and finally the fall of the Berlin Wall, a process which framing a response to answering 'why' cannot encapsulate. Historians themselves cannot decide when or why the Cold War ended. Asking 'why' does have its historical merits, allowing the historian to distill forces that shaped Communism's

collapse, but these forces lose their significance if the dimension of time cannot surface.

The question form then, by being slightly mismatched from history, hinders the distillation of a chronology by denying the surfacing of the chronological span of the reasons themselves. Framing the topic along factorial lines also denies students the opportunity to consult the wisdom of the majority of historical accounts that stress the process of the end of the Cold War. Historical accounts answer 'how' and not the question students are being asked. Asking 'how' the Cold War ended is more historically accurate, and does not require a change in the content points that are being taught to our students. Moreover, this linguistic change allows the question sieve key nuances of process that are key to understanding this phenomenon. When discussing history that is made up of processes, the 'why' is unable to elicit historical understanding without the 'how' (Clark, 2013). Subtle linguistics of inquiry shape the way content is marshalled, and the way we marshal content promotes or hinders the emergence of historical concepts and an understanding of the historical item in question.

Some of our often-used tropes linguistically hinders the historicity of classroom inquiry. Consider the asking for a 'main reason' or the most 'significant factor', perhaps one of the most common question types used. 'Main factor' questions are fundamentally historically distortive. While it forces students to accept the multicausality of historical phenomena (Woodcock, 2005), the question itself suggests that events have a 'main factor' that can be isolated exclusively and placed above others, which is almost never the case in history. Historical causation operates on 'more important', never 'most important'. Factors are constructs in

themselves, and only operate in relation to other factors. While ‘factors’ are a necessary distillation for the comprehension of the 15–16-year-old, elevating them into units of history circumvents historical understanding. Distilling a main factor deliberately holds students back from uncovering the symbiotic relationships between historical forces. Furthermore, the factors students are asked to compare generally have incomparable roles. One cannot strictly compare underlying constants, trigger factors or lead-up factors and pass judgement on why one is above another, because there philosophically cannot be a legitimate historical criterion to compare

them. It cannot be said that the roots of a tree are more important than the leaves. Students should be taught to compare constants with constants, triggers with triggers, lead-ups with lead-ups, piecing together *how* the factors from different categories work together to create an event, and debate their weight within their categories (Woodcock, 2005; Chapman, 2003). By forcing students to find a ‘main reason’, historical content essentially flattens history into artificial units. Distilling main reasons drills students to replicate a fundamentally distortive practice of history that bears little resemblance to how historians operate.

Pitfalls in Inquiry Historicity

When planning an inquiry question, teachers should not only look into the pedagogical value of the questions to be asked, but also the historicity of the said questions. Lapses in question historicity often lead to historically distorted answers which lead to misunderstandings, and can often deny students from accessing and appreciating key second-order concepts.

Teachers could ask the following questions while planning their inquiries:

1. Are the questions historically accurate, and do they encapsulate the key essence of the unit of study?
2. Will the answers that students give in response to the question be historically accurate, or will it be a distortion?
3. Will the question be able to elicit key processes in history, and account for the dimension of time?
4. Will the question help students to categorize and understand the significance and interplay of key factors?

In the introduction to his book *The Sleepwalkers* (2012), Christopher Clark, explains the link between the questions we ask and the history we produce. Clark argues that ‘questions of why and how are logically inseparable, but they lead us in different directions.’

The question of how invites us to look closely at the sequences of interactions that produced certain outcomes. By contrast, the

question of why invites us to go in search of remote and categorical causes... The ‘why’ approach brings a certain analytical clarity, but it also has a distorting effect, because it creates the illusion of a steadily building causal pressure; the factors pile on top of each other pushing down on the events; political actors become mere executors of forces long established and beyond their control. (Clark, 2012)

In this short reflection, Clark shows us the importance of considering the historicity and temporality of the questions we ask, for the wrong questions lead us down the wrong rabbit hole, which leads us to a distortive understanding of history. While asking ‘why’ allows us to deeply evaluate key junctures of history, it struggles to elicit accounts of larger temporalities. It is thus important to think deeply not only on the pedagogical value of the questions we ask, but also about the historicity of these questions, because they directly affect the validity of student’s understanding not only of the history but also of second-order concepts. For concept-based teaching to work, we need to ask good historical questions, and model to students what real historical inquiry entails.

Asking How

So, what makes a good ‘historical’ question and a good ‘historical’ answer? Taking reference from professional historians themselves, good questions help bring out as much credible ‘history’ as possible from the fragments of the past, guiding the enquirer to sieve out as much causation, significance and chronology (Elton, 1967). Good questions are revealing: able to direct the historian to aspects that add nuance and challenge prior notions of our understandings (Carr, 1961). They are temporal: able to highlight the pinnacle trait of historical study – the focus on time, change and continuity. Good questions are an antecedent that helps the historian elicit linkages between aspects of the past and answer why history went along the path it did. Questions must also prompt the enquirer to think of how representative their findings are as claims to the past (Elton,

1967).

Asking ‘how’ fits the criterion laid out above, and it is no surprise that it is the *modus operandi* of historical study. Asking ‘how’ on any historical phenomenon will always be historical. Christopher Clark’s *The Sleepwalkers* asks the question of how World War I began, not who is to blame for starting World War I, nor what caused World War I to start (Clark, 2012). Margaret Macmillan’s *Paris 1919* asks how the peacemakers developed their decisions in Paris and how these decisions shaped the world thereafter, not whether the Treaty of Versailles was a fair treaty (Macmillan, 2001). Ian Kershaw’s *Hitler* states on its first page that it asks ‘How had Hitler been possible’ and ‘How could Hitler exercise power’ (Kershaw, 2009). In fact, the whole reading list that underpins the syllabus are accounts of narration that answer ‘how’.

A response to ‘how’ is most often a chronological narrative. For historians, it is an evaluative narrative that stops at key junctures to explain things and to debate others. This presentation is uniquely able to capture temporality and its complexity because it is the only way to explain the past in a way that makes sense *no matter what analytical lens falls on it*, because of the inescapable fact that the past happened in that order and in that logic. While we cannot expect students to write the way historians write at school level, it might be helpful to think of how we can expose students to this narration and to have them develop a story-based ‘stop and think’ mentality when approaching history. We cannot write off narration as didactic or unthinking, and then eschew it, because it does not have to be.

How versus Why questions	
<p>It is important for teachers to use a mixture of ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions, as they elicit different dimensions to the historical item under scrutiny. They also stress on the usage of different second-order concepts and have different purposes in leading to historical understanding.</p>	
<p>How</p> <p>E.g., “How did the Cold War end?”</p> <p>Leads the inquirer to discover the sequence of events that led to the phenomenon. (Chronology)</p> <p>Stresses key concepts of chronology, historical empathy, change and significance.</p> <p>Leads the inquirer to think about the significance of factors in time.</p> <p>Leads the inquirer to discover the interplay between structure and agency.</p> <p>Primarily deals with understanding a chronological span.</p> <p>Invites the inquirer to stop at key junctures of a narration to evaluate factors.</p> <p>Invites the inquirer to develop a cohesive analytical narrative to account for the history.</p>	<p>Why</p> <p>E.g., “Why did the Cold War end?”</p> <p>Leads the inquirer to discover categorical causes that led to the phenomenon. (Causation)</p> <p>Stresses key concepts of causation, significance, change, diversity and evidence.</p> <p>Leads the inquirer to think about the significance of factors in logical mechanism.</p> <p>Leads the inquirer to isolate factors of structure and agency.</p> <p>Primarily deals with understanding a historical turning point.</p> <p>Invites the inquirer to place factors into key junctures of narration.</p> <p>Invites the inquirer to develop self-contained arguments to account for history.</p>

So why have we consistently eschewed asking ‘how’ in the classroom, and solely focused on teaching students to answer ‘why’? I asked three senior teachers for their thoughts. First, the teachers explained that ‘How’ was foresworn in an effort to combat didactic storytelling. When inquiry and analytical history was introduced, narrative history was seen as backward and antithetical to deep analysis, hindering the process of breaking down history into its most significant factors and debating them.

To these teachers, answering ‘how’ too easily leads to teachers forcing students to memorize a story, and having students recreate this story in exams, thus hindering concept-based and inquiry-based teaching. The narrative the teacher propagated was *the* narrative to be learnt, and the complexity of many of the historical phenomena made it such that it was difficult for the teacher to teach multiple narratives and have students compare them, especially in the time and exam limited constraints of

history teaching. Multiple factors are a much lower bar to entry for debate and analysis than multiple narratives.

Second, other teachers are concerned that recreating ‘how’ might be extremely difficult not only for their students, but for themselves. Constructing a narrative requires filling minute gaps between factors in a historically empathetic fashion, which can daunt teachers who have been away from professional history for some time. Furthermore, many teachers have also only known one narrative to the story, especially since many are not directly trained in the European and American history that the World History syllabus relies upon, and the effort required for teachers to master competing narratives while juggling their countless other commitments was a struggle many wanted to avoid. Teachers are also concerned when teaching counter-intuitive aspects of history. Historical logic does not always follow presentist logic, and teachers are often concerned that students will not buy the narratives they have imparted because it appears irrational to the students (Portal, 1987). How could interwar Germany embrace a dictator like Hitler, when evidence of Nazi violence was already everywhere before he was elected? How could Stalin consolidate his power when the idea of Stalin as ruler was vehemently rejected by Lenin? How did the Cold War start and end? These are all stories with fine points that takes a Historian several books to unpack, so how can this information be imparted to students?

These are legitimate concerns – some teachers might be tempted to engage in didactic storytelling, while others might struggle in telling the same story in multiple ways with the constraints placed on them. However, the history fraternity are now in a much better position than we think in implementing a temporal dimension to our questioning and inquiry. We now have a

stronger culture of inquiry, a more developed appreciation of second-order concepts, and a stronger focus on developing depth of understanding than breadth of content. Furthermore, the reduction of syllabus content load also gives more space to teachers to develop understanding, as epitomized by the preponderance of historical inquiry projects in schools.

Even the matter of content mastery can be addressed, and is largely a matter of teacher exposure to literature reviews, something teachers already often do. And with regards to the struggles students might have: students are already learning to link factors and to weigh them, so the next logical move towards historicity is to develop their ability to weave this analysis into their explanations, rather than relegating these gems to their conclusion paragraphs. The next logical step to our approach in historical teaching is to debunk the idea that narratives and deep analysis are mutually exclusive. Pitching can simplify but cannot distort history. We are obliged as teachers to impart a historically accurate picture of the past to students.

Mechanics of How

Implementing chronology and accounts in the classroom begins inquiring into both the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of the past. Neglecting the ‘why’ compromises on our analysis of the past and its distillation into history, neglecting the ‘how’ flattens any analysis and leads to parochialism. This section looks at how we can execute the ‘how’. In truth, we are not starting from scratch. In other subjects such as in English, Geography and Design and Technology, teachers are training students to think through 5Ws and 1H of who, what, where, when, why and how, and the question of ‘how’ and its linguistic tropes and dynamics are unlikely to be alien to

students (MOE, 2021). The key for the teacher is to tap on the linguistic nuances of ‘how’ to help students unpack the topic, and to use the permutations of how as supplementary questions to unpack the nooks and crannies of the past.

Asking how a phenomenon happened is deeply intertwined with developing student’s understanding of chronology. Answering ‘how’ requires an accurate recount of the sequence of events, and an appropriate understanding of the links of causation. Answering for instance, how Japan lost World War II, brings students through the order of events, from Pearl Harbor, to Midway, to the island-hopping campaign, and eventually the Bomb. It also exposes students to how factors overlap across time, the presence of multiple chronologies, and the concurrency of historical phenomena, such as the firebombing and the island-hopping campaigns (Hadyn, 2015). In the process of answering how Pearl Harbor leads to Midway, and how Midway allowed for the island-hopping campaign to happen, students start to see how time compresses and expands, and develops a sense of

duration over the process. Midway happened six months after Pearl Harbor, but the Bomb only came three years later, and we start to ask why, and what happened in the interim. The Bomb, Pearl Harbor and Midway also become situated in a larger span of time, along the timelines of scientific development, of American naval supremacy and longer-term American isolationist timelines. A way for the teacher to approach this in the classroom is to have students’ story-tell the way towards Japan’s defeat, with students inheriting parts of the story and figuring out the links between the event in front and the event after, whilst accounting for gaps in time and duration. The teacher can then challenge and refine these linkages and co-construct a thick description of the events as a summary. In assessment, the student will recreate this chronology, and the teacher will scrutinize these linkages to see if students understand how the history unfolded. Because of the number of links students have to draw, and how later parts of the storyline is contingent upon adequate linkages built by the student in previous parts, it becomes much easier to detect presentist logic and to sieve out mistakes in understanding.

Using Thick Descriptions to Unpack Historical Events

Developed by the social scientist Clifford Geertz (1973), a ‘thick description’ is a narrative or a description of human social action, which includes the context as interpreted by the actors as well. This method has been heavily absorbed into professional historical practice, and has found a heavy place especially in social and cultural history. In historical practice, ‘thick descriptions’ often appear as a narrative that stops at key junctures to provide a historically empathetic account of why something occurred, or why an actor acted the way they did from the perspective of the actor. In the classroom, students can be asked to develop their own ‘thick descriptions’ to how an event occurred, where they piece together a chronology using pieces provided by the teacher and the textbook, while stopping to evaluate the significance of the key pieces provided. A simplified sample of a possible narrative that students can recreate using Thick Descriptions based on the above scenario on Japan and World War II is recreated below.

How did Japan lose World War II?

Japan lost World War II due to a steadily degenerating military situation. When the Japanese carried out the bombings at Pearl Harbor, they expected to completely destroy the American Pacific Fleet so as to have a free hand in the Pacific theatre. Because most of the Pacific Fleet happened to be out at sea during the raid, the Pacific Fleet largely stayed intact and remained superior to the Japanese Navy. The Americans, repulsed by the unprovoked attack, declared war on Japan. Soon, the remainder of the Pacific Fleet waged a decisive naval victory against the Japanese at Midway. Japan lost all control they had over the waters of the Pacific. This victory further gave the Americans naval capabilities to move troops closer to Japan. The Americans developed a strategy to 'island hop' towards Japan, landing troops unobstructed due to their naval supremacy and steadily securing islands that could act as airfields to conduct raids on Japan. This was a long process which took most of three years, as each island was heavily defended by the Japanese, who saw the threat of any establishment of American air supremacy. The steady movement towards Japan allowed the Americans to firebomb Japanese cities with increasing intensity, which massively curtailed the will of the citizenry to continue the war. When the closest islands of Okinawa and Iwo Jima were secured, coupled with the fall of Nazi Germany, which allowed for the Allies to focus on the Pacific theatre happened, the Americans debated the invasion of Japan against the possibility of using the Atomic Bomb. The Americans had secretly developed the Atomic Bomb as a new powerful weapon that would entrench their military supremacy. The Atomic Bomb was chosen to reduce American casualties and to attempt to force a Japanese surrender before the Soviets could stage an invasion. The double threat of an impending Soviet invasion, together with the shattering of morale after the Bomb, led to the Japanese surrender.

Answering ‘how’ also gives students leverage in understanding the mechanisms of the historical process. Asking how acts as an antecedent in bringing students through the mechanics behind how historical accounts are constructed by professionals. Exposure to logical links and the flow of narratives allows students to develop a sense of a good narrative, and develop an organic understanding of the criteria of good accounts. It turns invisible the currently rather opaque wall of how the information within the textbook came about. Answering a subsidiary question of “how do we know” helps convince students of the foundations of our historical knowledge. For instance, having students see and use the Wannsee Conference Minutes, early newspaper reports on Dachau, as well as Holocaust memoirs, helps students realize how historians have a firm basis to build knowledge on ‘how the Holocaust came about’. Having students build history from ground up also allows stronger students to challenge the factors that permeate our current approach, allowing them to see factors as constructs and not a given. One way to conduct this is to have students construct their own narratives based on some information, and then give students additional information which will cause them to recalibrate their interpretations. Students will realize that the way they constructed their linkages might be different from their peers, even when they were given the same building blocks of the past. They all sound valid, and gain an appreciation of the multiplicity of accounts, and the role of the historian in curating the information (Lee, 1998). However, with more information provided, students will see how these narratives begin to change and merge around a consensus. This reflects the historical process, where interpretations themselves change over time. Students will also soon realize that there cannot be an indefinite number of valid descriptions of history because verifiable new information

invalidates previously held conjectures. In assessment, students have a range of narratives and logical links that they can use to answer a ‘how’ question, and their choice of explanations will reflect their opinions on factualness, truthfulness and their ability to arbitrate between historical interpretations.

It is likely that students who are used to flattened conceptualisations of history may struggle to appreciate this new dimension of time, and the intricacies of nuanced linkages that answering ‘how’ will inevitably introduce. However, this new dimension holds the key to understanding the currently under-served second-order concepts. Therefore, the challenge for teachers is pitching and differentiating in developing the ‘how’, an aspect that definitely requires further research into. A few broad parameters can guide how we start. We need to help students master the vocabulary of historical practice, something already done now, but will take on a greater urgency (Chambers, 2007). This is something that can be differentiated in pace and terminology. Another key differential will be on the complexity of the narratives, and the extent of distillation into factorized blocks. The same story can be told in many levels of increasing difficulty, and it will be up to teachers to judge and pace students in accessing the past. A final differential will be in student’s access to narratives. Narrative writing is something taught to students in English way before argumentative or discursive writing, but using evidence backed narrative might be a challenge (MOE, 2020). The teacher will be well served in tapping on the formats of understanding and presentation students are already familiar with in helping them develop prerequisite skills of historical answering.

Conclusion

This article began with a search for tools to facilitate the teaching of content and second-order concepts, especially the key concept of chronology. To solve this, I proposed taking a deeper look into the historicity of inquiry questions that were asked. Beyond the pedagogical value of these questions, the historical dimensions to our classroom inquiries shape our ability to teach content and second-order concepts. The linguistic nuances and answering parameters shape the way students' access, remember and process history. Too often are question forms mismatched to content, and too often are the linguistic nuances of the questions we ask hindering the development of historical understanding. 'Why' questions currently predominate our questioning, primarily because it is perceived as assessable and also counteractive against didactic and unthinking narration. However, this predominance of 'why' has led us to inculcate a 'flattened' form of history, which has curtailed our ability to develop concepts that have a specific 'time-bound' dimension that is unique to the discipline. Asking 'why' has also led us into rabbit holes of factorization and weighing that are acutely ahistorical and unnuanced, leading us to ask questions that have unintentionally curtailed student's understanding of key second-order concepts. In response, I proposed modelling our historical approach on the historian's craft, introducing 'how' inquiries to elicit a deliberately temporal dimension to teaching content. 'How' questions counteract several of the dilemmas we face in teaching second-order concepts, and gives students a look-in into the way history is crafted. Having students answer 'how' questions directly tests their ability to synthesize chronologies and appreciate the mechanics of how historians craft historical accounts. Furthermore, I believe that we are in a good place to start using 'how' more often in our classrooms. Our students have

some of the key foundational tools to handle this, but it does require a large paradigm shift in historical teaching that I think is a worthwhile endeavor to pursue. In our quest for greater historical understanding in the classroom, this appears to me as the next practicable step.

Note

This article was written while the author was a student-teacher at NIE, in 2020.

References

- Afandi, Suhaimi and Baildon, Mark. (2010). History Education in Singapore. *Contemporary Public Debates Over History Education*, (pp.223-42)
- Alexievich, Svetlana. (2017). *Second Hand Time*. London: Fitzcarraldo Editions.
- Carr, Edward Hallet. (1961). *What is History?* London: Penguin.
- Chambers, Christopher, (2007). "Teaching Causal Reasoning." In Martin Hunt (editor), *A Practical Guide to Teaching History in the Secondary School*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Chapman, A. (2003). 'Camels, diamonds and counterfactuals: a model for teaching causal reasoning', in *Teaching History*, 112. (pp.46-53)
- Clark, Christopher M. (2013). *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe Went to War in 1914*. London: Harper Collins.
- Curriculum Planning & Development Division (CPDD), Ministry of Education (MOE), Singapore (2012). *Upper Secondary History Teaching and Learning Guide*. Singapore: MOE CPDD.
- Curriculum Planning & Development Division (CPDD), Ministry of Education (MOE), Singapore (2020). *English Language Syllabus, Secondary Express Course Normal (Academic) Course*. Singapore: MOE CPDD.
- Curriculum Planning & Development Division (CPDD), Ministry of Education (MOE), Singapore (2021). *Geography Teaching and Learning Syllabus, Lower Secondary Express Course Normal (Academic) Course*. Singapore: MOE CPDD.
- Elton, Geoffrey (1967). *The Practice of History*. London: Fontana Books.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gorman, M. (1998) 'Structured Enquiry Approach, in *Teaching History*, 92. (pp.20-25)
- Haydn, T., Stephen, A., Arthur J. and Hunt, M. (2015). *Learning to Teach History in the Secondary School, 4th edn*. London: Routledge.
- Howells, Gary (1998). *Being Ambitious with the Causes of the First World War: Interrogating Inevitability*. Historical Association.
- Kershaw, Ian (2009). *Hitler*. London: Penguin.
- Lee, Peter (1998). 'A lot of guess work goes on' children's understanding of historical accounts'. *Teaching History*.
- Lee, Peter. (2005). *How Students Learn: History in the Classroom*. Washington DC: National Research Council, The National Academies Press.
- Ling, Judy and Paul, Aron (2013). *All About History Unit 2: The World in Crisis*. Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Ling, Judy and Paul, Aron (2014). *All About History Unit 3: Bi-Polarity and the Cold War*. Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Portal, C. (1987). 'Empathy as an objective in history teaching', in C. Portal (ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers*. London: Falmer Press.
- Riley, M. (2000). Into the Key Stage 3 history garden: choosing and planting your enquiry questions, in *Teaching History*, 99. (pp.8-13)

Taubman, William (2017). *Gorbachev: His Life and Times*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Woodcock, J. (2005). 'Does the linguistic release the conceptual? Helping Year 10 to improve their causal reasoning' in *Teaching History*, 119. (pp.5-14)