*HSSE Online* 13(1) 75- 87

# Beyond the PEEL: Reflections and Explorations on Instruction in Argumentative Writing in Singapore History Classrooms

**Gavin Swee**

*National Institute of Education (Singapore)*
*Nanyang Technological University (Singapore)*

**Abstract**

*Beyond investigating into the past and interrogating sources, the practice of History involves a significant communicative aspect – learners are also expected to read and write History. However, historical writing in Singapore schools is often subordinated to expedient writing frames, which often prioritise writing outcomes over the growth of student thinking processes. Through a survey of the literature in historical writing (and reading), this paper makes the case for focusing on historical writing in instructional design and discusses some of the instructional strategies that can help to bring that vision into the Singapore classroom.*

## I. Introduction

The Humanities Inquiry Approach has undergirded the teaching of History in Singapore schools for more than a decade. In this time, much attention has been paid to the philosophy, beliefs, and practices surrounding Inquiry as an instructional framework in History. Within the third stage of inquiry, "Exercising Reasoning," efforts in school have mostly been focused on growing students' competencies in interpreting, evaluating, and analysing sources, possibly because of the perceived tangible benefits this brings when it comes to examinations. Less attention has been devoted to growing students' abilities in communicating their interpretations through cogent historical arguments. This is arguably troubling as the full potential of inquiry as a means for students to engage with the nature and disciplinary attributes of History, as well as to develop students' critical and reasoning skills, may thus not be fully realised. The rich interpretive work encouraged by inquiry, which fosters an appreciation for multiple perspectives, can become limited if students' ability to construct compelling and cogent arguments is insufficiently developed.

This article begins with an exploration of the importance of writing – particularly of the argumentative genre – within an instructional programme in History. I then consider current pedagogical practices and discuss how such practices might evolve through a brief survey of instructional strategies suggested in research literature. Where relevant, I also highlight areas and issues that deserve closer examination, particularly as they pertain to the Singapore context.

The ideas discussed in this essay stem from a reflective engagement with current practices and a brief, preliminary and rudimentary survey of relevant literature, both grounded in my necessarily limited experiences in Singapore schools. Consequently, this piece should be viewed less as an authoritative treatise and more as a point of departure and an invitation for broader dialogue and collaborative exploration into how we might collectively enhance writing instruction in History classrooms.

## II. Why Teach Writing?

First, writing is central to History as a discipline. It has been more than a decade since the Ministry of Education foregrounded conceptual understandings (particularly, second-order concepts that underpin and define the disciplinary practice of History). Writing remains the key platform for students to demonstrate their understanding and application of these conceptual understandings. Nokes and De La Paz (2018) observe that:

> Argumentative historical writing, through which historians defend their interpretations, their use of evidence, their research methodologies, and the significance of their work, represents the pinnacle of historical writing according to researchers in the US (Bain, 2006), France (Rouet, Perfetti, Favart, & Marron, 1998), the Netherlands (van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008), and Canada (Seixas & Morton, 2013).

The authors further cite Monte-Sano (2010)'s argument that "historical arguments require 'conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge of historical analysis, an underlying grasp of the topic and discipline, and background content knowledge'" (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018), suggesting that in writing argumentatively, students are in fact demonstrating their learning and engagement with the discipline.

Monte-Sano (2011) goes further to argue that beyond simply being a vehicle for students to demonstrate their disciplinary understandings, instruction that incorporates writing can foster and deepen such disciplinary understandings in students. This is based upon the "conception of History as an interpretive discipline grounded in evidence that is analysed, not simply accepted" (Monte-Sano, 2011). Given the nature of the discipline as one that is interpretive and open to multiple accounts, a disciplinary approach to History not only leads to an emphasis on reading and writing, but instruction that emphasises argumentation can also lead to growth in students' capacities at disciplinary thinking (Monte-Sano, 2010). Just like historians, when students engage in writing history, they "apply concepts such as time, change, context, empathy, and evidence to their analyses. They engage in such procedures as researching, critiquing sources of evidence, or constructing interpretations" (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018).

Second, writing is beneficial for students' learning, particularly in the acquisition of content and in fostering first-order conceptual understandings. Nokes and De La Paz (2018) cite research that suggests that as students learn to produce argumentative historical writing, they "engage in knowledge transformation and develop richer content knowledge, which they retain at significantly higher rates for longer periods of time." According to Klein and Rose (2010), knowledge transformation takes place during writing as students restructure knowledge, create new meaning from existing content areas, and engage in meaning-making in intellectual moves that are distinct from knowledge-telling. The following example illustrates the knowledge transformation that takes

place when students engage in argumentative writing:

> Students writing an argument adopt a rhetorical goal, such as providing evidence. This requires that the student has some relevant topic knowledge; if the student does not, then he or she could set the content subgoal of solving this problem. The writer could draw on some previous knowledge and make new inferences from it. … Or, … the student may read some relevant nonfiction, researching information that bears on the claim. The writer would then make inferences about how this information bears on the claim, forming new claim-evidence relationships. … Alternatively, the student could modify the claim, or investigate the opposing point of view. Any of these would contribute to transformations in the writer's knowledge (Klein and Rose, 2010).

Beyond argumentation, even the act of explaining in writing invites writers to understand processes and theories (Klein and Rose, 2010), which again challenges students to move beyond simple regurgitation or repetition of content knowledge. As argued by Barton (2013), writing "places control of learning in the hands of students themselves, so that they have a chance to construct their own ideas instead of simply reproducing what they encounter from teachers, texts, or other sources."

Given that instruction in History that intentionally and carefully incorporates discipline-specific ways of reading (see sub-section III(A) below) and writing could lead to knowledge transformation for students, it therefore also serves the purpose of deepening students' content understandings. Nokes and De La Paz (2018) argue that not only does writing-focused instruction in History help students "retain content knowledge better than … traditional, lecture-focused instruction," writing argumentative essays based on reading from multiple texts "produces greater content learning than other types of writing" (Wiley & Voss, 1999, as cited in Nokes & De La Paz, 2018).

## III. Rethinking the Teaching of Writing in Singapore History Classrooms

In my decade of experience teaching History and leading teams in the implementation of Singapore's History curricula, as well as in my current role as a teacher educator, I have found that instructional strategies and teacher professional development on the teaching of writing have typically been focused on addressing the superficial perceived demands of writing to score well for examination questions, rather than on the processes of writing and argumentation themselves. History teachers in Singapore cannot escape (and indeed, have perhaps rarely thought beyond) providing students with writing frames such as the Point, Evidence, Explanation, Link (PEEL) format, or in training students to structure their responses to questions based on immutable sentence starters or phrases like, "I agree with the statement because…," and "However, I also disagree because…."

Commonly-cited reasons include: (i) limited curriculum time that is often subject to further disruptions to the teaching timetable; (ii) school-designated Weighted Assessment weeks which corresponds with the need to calibrate student progress and ensure adequate 'preparation'[i]; (iii) the belief that students naturally lack the ability to write argumentatively given their weak language ability; (iv) such writing frames are quick for students to remember and operationalise given the three reasons above; and (iv) the teaching of writing should be done solely by English Language teachers. I posit that beyond these factors, History teachers themselves may need more professional development in argumentation and teaching writing before they are fully

confident in moving beyond these writing frames. In sum, the teaching of writing is product-oriented (with the product being written pieces that can help students score well in examinations), rather than process-oriented—that is, where the learning takes place with and through writing, and the focus is on the intellectual moves required when writing (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018).[ii]

With my brief survey of the benefits of writing (and the teaching of writing) in History in the previous section, the rest of this piece assumes that paying closer attention to writing and its associated instructional processes would be beneficial in bringing students closer to attaining the aims of our History curriculum. I will discuss instructional processes and practices suggested by various scholars, and briefly explore the considerations, opportunities, and challenges of applying these suggested strategies in the Singapore History classroom.

### *A. Repositioning Reading and Writing in our History Classrooms*

As alluded to above, students stand to benefit when teachers devote time and resources to writing instruction. Rather than viewing writing as an adjunct to, or discrete from, the learning of History, teachers should consider student writing as *essential* to the learning of History, and that they have a responsibility to teach writing in their classrooms despite the challenges they face. Correspondingly, teachers could develop their instructional programmes consciously to incorporate reading and writing as part of instruction in content, concepts, and examination strategies. If one accepts that the "nature of tasks and instruction influence the development of students' argumentative writing in the classroom" (Monte-Sano, 2011), then a shift away from reading and writing tasks that call for basic comprehension or summary is in order. Such tasks inhibit "a conception of History as an interpretive discipline grounded in evidence that is analysed, not simply accepted" (Monte-Sano, 2011). Correspondingly, writing activities should shift away from fill-in-the-blank worksheets, copying from slides, or multiple-choice questions (Duke et al., 2012; VanSledright, 2014; Ercikan & Seixas, 2015, as cited in Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). After all, as Monte-Sano et al. (2015) argue:

> Students cannot learn to consider multiple perspectives, critique what they read, or develop an argument if history lessons focus solely on memorising names and dates or filling in bubbles on a Scantron sheet. Instead, focusing on historical interpretation gives students a chance to read critically and form their own ideas.

I proceed now to suggest a possible strategy for teachers' consideration when planning to infuse writing-rich activities into their instruction. When planning for units of study, teachers could take reference from the teacher in Monte-Sano's (2011) study and intentionally plan multiple writing activities around key issues of historical inquiry. These writing activities, especially in the initial phases of instruction (e.g. Secondary 1 during the two-year Lower Secondary History Programme, and Secondary 3 during the two- or three-year Upper Secondary History Programme) and at the start of investigating a particular issue, need not be modelled after the final product (i.e., either the essay or particular source-based question types) that students will be required to produce in the examinations. A possible sequence could resemble the following:

i. Teachers could start with short free writing exercises for students to ask questions or communicate their (limited) understanding of facts and the

chronology surrounding a historical phenomenon or actor.

ii. In the next stage, teachers could introduce curated sources and corresponding writing exercises for students to investigate and interpret the issue a little deeper.

iii. Subsequently, students could be assigned to – or select – different perspectives, angles or actors (perhaps based on the sources that they encountered in Stage ii above) and write position papers based on the perspectives they take on. Lesson time can also be devoted to students discussing their writing and seeking to understand and evaluate theirs and others' perspectives.[iii]

iv. Finally, students could submit a longer argumentative essay that requires them to state their own opinion while incorporating the analysis, discussion and writing done in the earlier stages.

Just as writing should not be a discrete learning process separate from content or conceptual acquisition, productive reading, too, is part of what Monte-Sano (2011) considers to be "discipline-specific literacy strategies." Monte-Sano (2011) further argues that "how students read influences their writing, and how they write is an indication of that reading. Reading and writing are related, not separate processes. They are foremost rooted in thinking—not just in basic comprehension, but questioning texts, recognising and evaluating authors' opinions." Similarly, Nokes and De La Paz (2018) observe that

> New theories have dispelled the long-held view of reading and writing as separate or even opposite processes. Instead, modern researchers argue that reading and writing involve similar cognitive processes and symbol systems (Graham & Hebert, 2010; Shanahan, 2006). Notions from 40 years ago that fluent reading was a prerequisite for writing instruction have been replaced by the idea that teaching the two processes together may streamline literacy development (Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000).

In sum, "reading and writing involve… complementary cognitive processes that can enhance learning when used together" (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018).

### *B. Strategies and Suggestions for Classroom Practice*

In this section, I discuss some possible strategies for how educators might move students beyond the trappings of frameworks like PEEL, based on my brief survey of the literature. It is not my intention here to be prescriptive; indeed, I have observed that most teachers have already incorporated at least some of the following strategies into their practice. Instead, I hope that this segment serves as a point of departure for further explorations, discussions, and research-backed classroom interventions that address the specific context of History teaching in the Singapore classroom.

i. The literature recommends frequent writing tasks: these could be informal or spontaneous (Monte-Sano, 2011; Barton, 2013), or periodic writing tasks that are extensions of these shorter writing exercises (Monte-Sano, 2011). These tasks should foster "productive disciplinary engagement" by being grounded in "authentic, intellectual problems" (Engle & Conant, 2002, as cited in Nokes & De La Paz, 2018) that arise as part of historical inquiry. In the context of our secondary school or pre-university classrooms, this means planning for such tasks to address the key issues of historical debate which shape the content areas, and for these tasks to activate student engagement with both the content and procedural

concepts which undergird the various units of study.

Monte-Sano (2011) argues that the provision of short, informal writing tasks gives students opportunities to read carefully, comprehend what they have read, and work through individual issues before synthesising the different perspectives (or sources) in their longer pieces. Such an approach allows students to "develop their content knowledge, and improve their thinking about the content" (Langer, 1986, as cited in Monte-Sano, 2011). Nokes and De La Paz (2018) further highlight that spontaneous writing exercises convert "tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge," and "may help the writer generate new ideas" (Ong, 2013, as cited in Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). This can be especially helpful as complex and multifaceted thinking could overload a student's working memory: writing then becomes a memory aid which creates opportunities to elaborate, process and organise ideas, and remove contradictions" (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). Barton (2013) adds that "when students react to information through [a spontaneous writing] activity, they construct their own understanding of it. Otherwise they are just memorising." Moreover, this could reap affective and motivational rewards, as "giving students a chance to write quickly about what they have been learning allows them to sift through their ideas and identify areas of both clarity and confusion, but without feeling the burden of producing an elaborate and polished composition" (Barton, 2013).

ii. As discussed above, writing cannot take place in a silo: it must be accompanied by productive reading. Monte-Sano's (2011) study found that growing students' ability to write argumentatively for History was supported, in part, by a move away from the use of a singular authoritative textbook; instead, students read compendia of primary documents and accounts by historians. One observes that such a practice could already shift students' mindset decisively away from history as a received body of knowledge towards one that is contestable and open to interpretation. In turn, this could ground students intellectually for the task of considering multiple perspectives before arriving at a considered and well-substantiated argument. Curation and the intentional selection of materials to aid disciplinary thinking, however, only forms one-half of a reading-rich instructional strategy: it must be accompanied by instruction in active and reflective reading. The teacher in Monte-Sano's (2011) study devoted instructional time on teaching students to annotate, for, annotation pushes students "to become active readers engaged with the text in many ways: asking and answering questions of themselves and the author, … making connections to prior knowledge and other texts, … [and] summarising" (Monte-Sano, 2011).

Besides the need to examine the specific processes when teaching students how to annotate, the issue of how to most effectively reap the benefits described above, given the constraints of the Singapore context, warrants further study. The teacher in Monte-Sano's (2011) study was able to design instruction in the way that he did because his students had strong literacy backgrounds, his class met for almost five hours each week, and there was no prescribed curriculum. All these are conditions that do not currently exist in Singapore schools: our classes typically have students of mixed readiness and

literacy levels, there is a prescribed syllabus to be completed in time for relatively high-stakes examinations, and for upper secondary History, anything more than *three* hours of instruction a week is a luxury. In spite – or perhaps precisely because – of these circumstances, there is an impetus to study how – and the extent to which – such instructional practices could benefit History students in Singapore schools. At the very least, teachers could experiment with some of these practices in their own classrooms to explore how they could potentially be beneficial for their students. As Monte-Sano (2011) observes, the strategies described "still merits study simply because so many of his practices have never been documented in the historical thinking literature."

iii. Scholars highlight the importance of explicit instruction in writing. This begins with frequent exposure to informational and argumentative texts, for "students who rarely read argumentative texts are unlikely to be able to produce argumentative texts. [Their] fluency with expository text structures continues to develop … as they are increasingly exposed to expository text (Galloway & Uccelli, 2015, as cited in Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). This exposure could then be supported by explicit instruction on the writing process, as well as features of good argumentative writing, particularly through the sharing of what Applebee and Langer (2006) call "mentor texts," which are "models that demonstrate elements of strong writing" (as cited in Nokes & De La Paz, 2018).

There is no dearth of studies on instructional strategies specific to writing that can grow students' competencies in writing argumentatively. In the following table, I present a brief summary of these proposed strategies for teachers' exploration:

**Table 1. Summary of proposed strategies for the developing of student writing in the classroom**

| Suggested Strategies or Approaches | Effects/Benefits^ | Researcher(s)* |
|---|---|---|
| Teaching students to engage in a planning monologue using planning cues | Increased young students' reflection during planning | Scardamalia, Bereiter, & Steinbach (1984) |
| Procedural facilitation through the provision of cues, prompts, routines | Helps students execute more complex composing processes | Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987) |
| Using mnemonics, text frames, "think sheets," and graphic organisers combined with teacher and peer interaction | Teaches students more sophisticated approaches to planning | Englert, Raphael, Anderson, Anthony, & Stevens (1991) |
| Scaffolding | Reduces the strain on a student's working memory | Stanford History Education Group (n.d.) |
| Providing simplified texts | | Wineburg & Martin (2011) |
| Providing guiding questions | | Reisman (2012) |

**Table 1. Summary of proposed strategies for the developing of student writing in the classroom**

| Suggested Strategies or Approaches | Effects/Benefits^ | Researcher(s)* |
|---|---|---|
| Explicit instruction on the goals of argumentative writing (in terms of content and audience) | Helps students support their claims with evidence and refute opposing positions | Midgette et al. (2008) |
| Providing students with specific writing prompts that outline the goals of argumentative text | *Not described in Nokes & De La Paz (2018).* | Ferretti, MacArthur, & Dowdy (2000) |
| Providing scaffolding in the form of templates, outlines, graphic organisers, and sentence starters | | McAlister, Ravenscroft, & Scanlon (2004) |

^ Where described in Nokes & De La Paz (2018).
*All as cited in Nokes and De La Paz (2018).

iv. Assessment and feedback in History should be focused on growing students' disciplinary thinking and writing. We are fortunate in Singapore that our assessments in History no longer privilege students' ability to recall and reproduce the putative 'facts' of History: whether in source-based questions, essays, or in Historical Investigation (HI) projects, assessment – at least in intent – foregrounds the disciplinary attributes of History. Students are tasked to explain and evaluate causal factors, interpret sources for perspective, message, and intent, evaluate the relative significance of historical events, and so on. Here lies an issue that should prompt reflection amongst History educators in Singapore: do our classroom practices support writing that demonstrates and honours disciplinary thinking, or do we – perhaps by circumstance – continue to teach primarily for adherence to prescribed structures and formats, despite the *intent* of our assessment items?

    Researchers have also stressed the importance of regular and timely feedback that emphasises attributes of disciplinary thinking such as "evidence-based thinking," and an "historically astute interpretation of issues and perspectives" (Monte-Sano, 2011; Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). This issue warrants further study given the potential challenges posed by Singapore's context. In schools, History enjoys fewer teaching periods relative to other subjects like English, Mathematics, and the Sciences. In recent years, there have been deployment and timetabling constraints posed by the introduction of Full Subject-Based Banding, which necessitates the deployment of more teachers to each teaching level. Taken together, in mainstream schools which offer instruction at all of the G1, G2, and G3 levels, History teachers typically juggle multiple teaching preparations, which could make providing regular and timely feedback on all formal and informal writing assignments somewhat unfeasible. Of course, with the introduction of much-touted artificial intelligence (AI) tools like the Short Answer Feedback Assistant in the Student Learning Space (SLS), there is the potential for technology to serve as a multiplier and customiser in providing

feedback to students. The affordances of AI – and the extent to which they can augment and replace the individualised and personalised feedback provided by History teachers on matters of disciplinary thinking – deserves closer study and experimentation.

The four strategies and processes discussed above could be applied as part of the Cognitive Apprenticeship instructional model advocated by Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989), which begins with modelling processes and gradually shifts responsibility over to the learner. The thinking for argumentative writing is first made visible to students through teacher modelling. In Cognitive Apprenticeship, teachers explicitly discuss the heuristics and reasoning processes used by experts and provide coaching and scaffolding as students begin to apply these strategies in their own work (Nokes & De La Paz, 2018). As students gain confidence and competence, teachers gradually release responsibility for reading, thinking, and writing, while continuing to offer feedback to support their independent use of cognitive and literacy practices (De La Paz et al., 2014). The key element of modelling is one strategy of explicit instruction; the gradual release of responsibility can be paced out over numerous writing exercises, while regular feedback helps students grow in confidence and competence in writing argumentatively.

## IV. Areas for Closer Consideration

As seen in the previous section, there is abundant research on teaching students how to write and how to write argumentatively. What warrants closer study seems to be the specific focus on *what argumentation is, and how to teach students to argue*, within the context of History education in Singapore. What are the features of argumentation? Beyond application of frameworks, what are the logical, cognitive and linguistic processes involved in the construction of strong arguments? How do we teach these to our students in light of disciplinary standards in History? In this section, I discuss briefly areas that teachers and researchers can explore. For a start, teachers could consider small interventions in specific areas based on their qualitative analysis of their students' work. For instance, for students who mechanically apply the PEEL framework but whose writing demonstrates an incongruity between the evidence/examples cited and the corresponding explanations, teachers could explore teaching strategies to help students explain the relationships between different elements of arguments.

Guidebooks like those by Chapman (2016) provide useful insights into what argumentation in History entails and how teachers might develop students' capacity to argue effectively. Chapman's guide outlines practical strategies for helping students recognise argumentation in historical writing, such as identifying claims and supporting reasons, analysing how historians justify their interpretations, and understanding the logic that underpins competing perspectives. It also provides activities to scaffold students' ability to construct their own arguments.

What warrants further study, however, is how these approaches can be incorporated into Singapore's History curriculum for argumentation to be taught explicitly and in ability-appropriate ways. To do so, I propose that researchers and practitioners also explore beyond our traditional disciplines into the fields of applied linguistics, epistemology, and philosophical reasoning. These fields can provide insights into the role of language in constructing arguments, the nature and forms of knowledge, and the ways of reasoning clearly and evaluating

interpretations. Given the myriad demands on teachers' time and focus, perhaps senior members of humanities departments can identify specific areas for teachers' professional development and curate bite-sized learning opportunities that also provide teachers with tools for immediate application in their classrooms. These could be done as short workshops as part of department meetings, professional learning communities (PLCs), or even as networked learning communities (NLCs) across schools.

Within the context of a school, teachers in the Humanities and English Language departments could collaborate in professional learning on – and designing instruction in – argumentative writing. I posit that a consistent and unified approach in the teaching of logical reasoning and argumentation across academic subjects and various school experiences could reap economies of scale and be mutually reinforcing for students.

Finally, both De La Paz and her colleagues (2014) and Monte-Sano (2011) acknowledge that there is currently insufficient breadth when it comes to research on writing development in History students: most studies focus on university students or higher readiness pre-university students; lesser attention has been paid to lower readiness students and those at the secondary level. Of course, there exists neither a systematic study – nor research-backed interventions – on how students learn to write in Singapore History classrooms. Given the unique characteristics of our Singapore classrooms, issues like scalability and applicability of suggested interventions (e.g., frequent feedback) could also be studied in greater depth.

## V. Conclusion

In this essay, I have suggested two impetuses for paying closer attention to teaching writing in History: first, argumentation is central to History as an interpretive and evidence-based discipline, and enables students to demonstrate and deepen their conceptual understandings. Second, intentionally teaching writing has noteworthy benefits for student learning. I have reflected on what I perceive to be the current product-oriented approach to writing instruction in Singapore History classrooms, and suggest that a shift in outlook towards focusing on writing instruction as a process, rather than a product, could transform our classroom practices and benefit disciplinary thinking and literacy in History.

As an educator, I am reminded that teaching writing in History is less about producing well-structured essays for examinations, but about fostering deep conceptual understanding, critical disciplinary engagement, and lasting knowledge transformation in our students. To achieve this, experimentation on the suggested instructional processes and strategies could uncover interventions that are feasible and especially effective for students in Singapore. A closer look at the mechanics and heuristics of argumentation, as well as research on how to teach argumentation, could go some distance towards achieving these aims. I also suggest that a more consistent and unified approach to teaching logical reasoning and argumentation across academic subjects within Singapore schools could reap beneficial professional outcomes for teachers and learning outcomes for students.

Beyond technical competence in writing and deeper disciplinary understandings, a refreshed approach towards writing in History instruction in Singapore could deepen student engagement and joy in learning, and develop students' 21st

Century Competencies in such areas as critical, adaptive and inventive thinking, as well as communication and information skills. By empowering students to communicate effectively in History today, we are playing a part in nurturing active contributors and concerned citizens who are equipped to navigate and shape the complexities of tomorrow.

**Acknowledgements**

I wish to express my gratitude to Delia Foo, Dr Suhaimi Afandi, Anna Cai, and Teo Ang Guan, whose ideas and questions helped shape my thinking for this piece.

**References**

*Works Directly Consulted*

Barton, K. C. (2013, April). Magic words: Writing as a tool for learning in the humanities. *HSSE Online*, *2*(1), 1–5. http://www.hsseonline.edu.sg/journal/volume-2-issue-1-2013/magic-words-writing-tool-learning-humanities

Chapman, A. (2016). *Developing students' understanding of historical interpretations*. Pearson (Edexcel A Level History).

De La Paz, S., Felton, M., Monte-Sano, C., Croninger, R., Jackson, C., Shim Deogracias, J., & Hoffman, B. P. (2014). Developing historical reading and writing with adolescent readers: Effects on student learning. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *42*(2), 228–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2014.908754

Klein, P. D., & Rose, M. A. (2010). Teaching argument and explanation to prepare junior students for writing to learn. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *45*(4), 433-461. https://libservy.nie.edu.sg/login.php?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/teaching-argument-explanation-prepare-junior/docview/758873874/se-2

Monte-Sano, C. (2011). Beyond reading comprehension and summary: Learning to read and write in history by focusing on evidence, perspective, and interpretation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *41*(2), 212–249. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00547.x

Monte-Sano, C., De La Paz, S., & Felton, M. (2015). Teaching argument writing and "content" in diverse middle school history classrooms. *Social Education*, *79*(4), 194–199.

Nokes, J. D., & De La Paz, S. (2018). Writing and argumentation in history education. In S. A. Metzger & L. M. McArthur Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 551–578). Wiley.

*Works Not Directly Consulted*

Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (2006). *The state of writing instruction in America's schools: What existing data tell us*. Center on English Learning and Achievement.

Bain, R. (2006). Rounding up unusual suspects: Facing the authority hidden in the history classroom. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(10), 2080-2114. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-9620.2006.00775.x

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture

of learning. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(1), 32-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X018001032

Duke, N. I. C., Caughlin, S., Juzwik, M., & Martin, N. (2012). Teaching genre with purpose. *Educational Leadership*, *69*(6), 34-39.

Engle, R. A., & Conant, F. R. (2002). Guiding principles for fostering productive disciplinary engagement: Explaining an emergent argument in a community of learners classroom. *Cognition and Instruction*, *20*(4), 399-483. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/51532690XCI2004_1

Englert, C. S., Raphael, T. E., Anderson, L. M., Anthony, H. M., & Stevens, D. D. (1991). Making strategies and self-talk visible: Writing instruction in regular and special education classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, *28*(2), 337-372. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312028002337

Ercikan, K., & Seixas, P. (Eds.). (2015). *New directions in assessing historical thinking*. Routledge.

Ferretti, R. P., MacArthur, C. A., & Dowdy, N. S. (2000). The effects of an elaborated goal on the persuasive writing of students with learning disabilities and their normally achieving peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*(4), 694-702. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.92.4.694

Fitzgerald, J., & Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, *35*(1), 39–50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3501_5

Galloway, E. P., & Uccelli, P. (2015). Modeling the relationship between lexicogrammatical and discourse organization skills in middle grade writers: Insights into later productive language skills that support academic writing. *Reading and Writing*, *28*(6), 797-828. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-015-9550-7

Graham, S., & Hebert, M. A. (2010). *Writing to read: Evidence for how writing can improve reading. A Carnegie Corporation Time to Act Report*. Alliance for Excellent Education.

Langer, J. (1986). Learning through writing: Study skills in the content areas. *Journal of Reading*, *29*(5), 400–406.

McAlister, S., Ravenscroft, A., & Scanlon, E. (2004). Combining interaction and context design to support collaborative argumentation using a tool for synchronous CMC. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *20*(3), 194-204. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2004.00086.x

Midgette, E., Maria, P., & MacArthur, C. (2008). The effects of content and audience awareness goals for revision on the persuasive essays of fifth-and eighth-grade students. *Reading and Writing*, *21*(1-2), 131-151. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-007-9067-9

Monte-Sano, C. (2010). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature of adolescents' writing. *Journal of Learning Sciences*, *19*(4), 539-568. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2010.481014

Ong, J. (2013). Discovery of ideas in second language writing task environment. *System*, *41*(3), 529-542.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.05.001

Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction*, *30*(1), 86-114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2011.634081

Rouet, J. F., Perfetti, C. A., Favart, M., & Marron, M. A. (1998). Understanding historical controversies: Students' evaluation and use of documentary evidence. *International Review of History Education*, *2*, 95-117.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C., & Steinbach, R. (1984). Teachability of reflective processes in written composition. *Cognitive Science*, *8*(2), 173-190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog0802_4

Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The big six: Historical thinking concepts*. Nelson Education.

Shanahan, T. (2006). Relations among oral language, reading, and writing development. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 171-183). Guilford.

Stanford History Education Group. (n.d.). *Charting the future of teaching the past*. Retrieved from http://shegstanford.edu/

van Drie, J., & van Boxtel, C. (2008). Historical reasoning: Towards a framework for analyzing students' reasoning about the past. *Educational Psychology Review*, *20*(2), 87–110. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-007-9056-1

VanSledright, B. (2014). *Assessing historical thinking and understanding: Innovative designs for new standards* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203464632

Wiley, J., & Voss, J. F. (1999). Constructing arguments from multiple sources: Tasks that promote understanding and not just memory for text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*(2), 301–311. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.91.2.301

Wineburg, S., & Martin, D. (2009). Tampering with history: Adapting primary sources for struggling readers. *Social Education*, *73*(5), 212–216.

[i] This is itself premised on the mindset that such assessments are valuable opportunities for students to be prepared for the formal, summative assessment tasks.

[ii] I wish to highlight that my statement here is not an indictment of practices in our classrooms or intended to be a sweeping conclusion on the state of History teaching in Singapore. As a classroom practitioner, I am fully cognisant of the numerous competing demands placed on History teachers which often necessitate the use of more expedient frameworks when teaching. I have alluded to some of these challenges in this section (see III(B)(ii) and III(B)(iv) below).

[iii] A good instructional strategy here would be Structured Academic Controversy.