

## **THE USE OF POKER AID IN DEVELOPING THINK PAIR SHARE MODEL TO IMPROVE THE STUDENTS' INTEREST IN LEARNING HISTORY**

**Lukman Nadjamuddin<sup>1</sup>**

### **ABSTRACT**

*The use of Poker Aid in developing Think Pair Share Model: an Effort of Improving senior high school Students' Interest in Learning History in Palu. The research purpose is to find out the effective use of Poker Aid in developing Think Pair Share implementation in relation to the improvement of senior high school students' learning interest in history in Palu. The research Method employed to develop the model is preceded by investigation, design, realisation, validation, implementation, and followed by providing training, modelling, teaching and learning activities. After the three tryout in four schools, the students' interest showed an increase particularly in the indicators of 1). Seriousness, 2). Curiosity, showed by asking questions to friends, 3). Curiosity, showed by asking questions to teachers, 4). Responding questions from teachers, 5). Providing feedbacks for teachers, 6). Not refusing presentation, 7). Not refusing being paired, 8). Enthusiasm during sharing activities, 9). Enthusiasm to do presentation, and 10). Jotting down to the important lessons. The aspect of learning achievement also improved. In SMA Negeri 1, students' mean score before tryout program was 74,89, and after the tryout program, increased to 87,65; In SMA Negeri 8, students' mean score before tryout program was 64,44, and after the tryout program increased to 74,89; In SMA Karuna Dipa, students' mean score before tryout program was 76,12, and after the tryout, it increased to 87,08; and in SMA PGRI 2 students' mean score before tryout program was 63,32, and after the tryout program, it increased to 71,55.*

**Key Words:** *Think Pair Share, Poker, and Effort of Improving Students' Interest*

---

<sup>1</sup>**Lukman Nadjamuddin**, lecturer of History Education, Tadulako University. For academic interest, the author can be contacted at office address: Kampus Bumi Bahari, Tadulako, Tondo, Palu.

## Introduction

History learning has not moved significantly from the lecturing method because students are still positioned as the object of teaching. The activities of the student is a limited using this method, to listening and writing activity only. Daliman (2005:114) states that the subject material conveyed in the classroom is merely a “story” about the reconstruction of the events and human activities in the past, which is abstract for students. As a result, learning history is limited to the development of memory, which is the lowest in cognition hierarchy. Ismaun (2001:99) found that students often complain of being bored in receiving and learning the history material.

The above facts are worrying and reducing the meaning of the history lesson as a tool of shaping the nation’s identity and personality as well as providing awareness to the learners to know themselves and their environment (Gunning, 1999:179). Suhartini (2001:29) states that in order to keep students interested and have passion in learning history, a teacher must be able to design and conduct learning activities that allows students to learn optimally and become the subject learning.

Hapsari (2006:1) states four indicators that make students resistance in learning history are:

1. The low value of students’ cognitive;
2. Repitition of the material;
3. Difficulty in memorizing, and
4. The learning process is not interesting or boring.

Suhartini (2001:6) argues that the learning method mistakes developed by history teachers are caused by the following factors:

1. Too many subjects to be conveyed making it more possible to take a shortcut, then usually ignore the affective and psychomotor aspects;
2. Teachers lack of adequate knowledge and understanding;
3. Teachers do not have the knowledge and skills to provide a teaching process of history that can attract students, and
4. Teachers tend to use one method in teaching the whole materials, without considering the characteristics of each topic in the material presented.

The mistakes in history learning reinforced by the fact that the career as an history teacher is not a moral call, but merely about getting a job (Umasih, 2006:5). A similar opinion is also expressed by Kumalasari (2005:12-13), that there are at least four components that are interconnected as the cause of the problem in the teaching of history:

1. Generally history teachers are poor in terms of historical knowledge because there are some kinds of intellectual laziness to explore the historical sources, either in the form of objects, documents or literature. The good history teachers are those who are able to stimulate and develop the students’ imagination in such a way, so that the historical narrative presented will challenge their curiosity;
2. The limited books of history and learning media;
3. Students’ attitude that are less positive toward history learning, and
4. The history learning method generally does not challenge the students’ knowledge.

Not to dismissive to the importance of recognizing other components, the reformation of history teaching method seems urgent, because it is affordable by the teacher and relatively low cost. Widja (1990:1) claimed that if we want to fix the bad image of history lesson, we should attempt to improve the way teachers teach history. Sanusi (1992:8) concludes that in order to work its function, the methods of teaching history in schools must be rearranged. Rearrangement of the history teaching method will not only trigger interest in learning, but also as a mean to process the students in obtaining good learning outcomes (Susatyo and Soejoto, 2005: 90).

1. The first step to revitalize the learning method is to try to understand how history should be taught. There are five elements that should be implemented in teaching history:
2. Variosity; any subject taught in monotonous way will certainly make the students get bored. This problem happens in the teaching of history because it is merely focused on the application of the lecture method, which become the image of history lesson. Moreover, most history teachers assume that in the same learning method the subject material can be transferred wholly from the teachers head heads to the students head (Suhartini, 2001:7).
3. From facts to analysis; teaching of history in schools emphasizes more on the historical facts and memorizational of the facts such as the actors, events, and scene. Thus the teacher should not simply ask “who is the proclaimer of Indonesia?”, but the question should

be developed into “why Soekarno - Hatta proclaimed the independence of Indonesia? Similarly, regarding the year and the place of events, the teacher do not only ask “what is the date of the proclamation of Indonesia’s?”, rather than ask why on the date of August 17, 1945 did Indonesia proclaime its independence, not on 16 or 18 August. and question is not like this: “Where is the declaration of the independence”, but why was it in Jakarta, and not in Yogyakarta or Surabaya?

4. According Mestika it is not enough for to only involving with cognitive knowledge by memorizing the facts about the past, as currently occurs (Reuters, August 13, 2005). Soedjatmoko (1976:15) but she suggests to put aside the history teaching method that prioritize the facts of history. This oppinion is very important to be implemented in the teaching history in order to avoid what is feared by Surachmad (1978:9) that the students do not successfully achieve the ability to see and think historically, their knowledge of history stop and are bound by a set of data, facts, and the names of people. Therefore, the teaching of history should not stop at the level of facts, but must enter the analysis domain.
5. Open and dialogical; the practice of teaching history is closed and monotonous, and potentially brings the students to a rigid classroom atmosphere, which result in a less interested attitude. Therefore, teachers should design learning process that is open and dialogical.
6. Divergence; in line with the history teaching that emphasizes the analysis

and dialogue, applying divergence is very important to avoid the tendency to only delivering a single fact in history teaching. Teaching history is not just  $15 + 15 = 30$ , but also ... (+, X, -, and :) ... = 30. Indonesia was able to declare its independence, not only through physical struggle, but also through diplomacy. It means that teaching history requires solving a problem by giving an opportunity to analyze and emerging many ideas for the students.

7. Progressive; history teaching needs to be based on progressive principles. Widja (1992:12) suggests that a new perspective of history education should be progressive and has a firm vision to the future. If history was about to serve as education, it must be able to provide intelligent solutions and deals with current social situation.

According to Said Hamid Hasan (2000:26), the cooperative learning grown lately can be used as a solution to overcome the lack of students' interests in the subject of history. Hill & Hill (1993:1-6) identifies various advantages of cooperative learning, one of which is to make the student happy. Gerson (2002:109), states that the benefits of cooperative learning includes: boosting motivation, improve learning outcomes and providing a long term memory of the material, all three of these are related to learning interest.

One model that can be applied to attract students in learning history is a *think-pair-share*. This model was developed by Spencer Kagan, which seeks to provide opportunities for students to work independently and in collaboration with other students. The main purpose of this model is to only optimize the students'

participation. This model can be used in all subjects and for the students in all grades. The steps in the learning using *think-pair-share* method is as follows:

1. Teacher divides students into groups and assigns task to all groups;
2. Each student thinks and does the tasks by themselves;
3. Students are paired with a peer in their groups and have a discussion with their partners, and
4. Finally, the two pairs will be grouped into four (Lie, 2004: 57-58).

In various discussions with *Musyawah Guru Mata Pelajaran Sejarah* (MGMP/the History Teachers Conference) of Palu revealed that almost all history teachers have poor innovation method and use the more monotonous lecture method while teaching in classroom, that resulted in the less interested and bored students to follow the lessons. This study attempts to explain the effective use of the poker aid in developing *think-pair-share* method application to increase student interest in history subject in senior high school in Palu.

### **Study Method**

The method used in this research is a development of the method proposed by Sugiono (2008:409) and Sukmadinata (2007:169-170), that is adapted to the needs of researchers. This study is preceded by investigation, design, realization, validation, and implementation, and followed by training, modeling, learning process implementation, analysis and reflection which produce modules and concept maps, the guideline of poker aid of *think-pair-share*, material organization and poker cards, and learning devices.

The subjects of this study were the history teachers and senior high school students of four high schools in Palu, determined by the following four criteria: SMA Negeri 1 Palu as the representation of favourite high school; SMA Negeri 8 Palu as the representation of the school in the suburb area of Palu; SMA Karuna Dipa as the representation of the advanced private high school, SMA PGRI 2 Palu as the representation of the poor private high school, then set one class target for each.

Aspect observed during the trial were the teacher’s way in combining the *think-pair-share* with poker game during class and the students’ learning interests and achievements. The learning interest indicators are reflected in the following ten components:

1. The seriousness,
2. Asking questions and responses to friend,
3. Asking questions and responses to the teacher,
4. Responding questions and issues raised by the teacher,
5. Providing feedback to the teachers,
6. Do not refuse when requested to do presentation in front of the class,
7. Do not refuse when asked to work in pairs,
8. Excited in having sharing partner,
9. Eager to follow the presentation, and
10. Writing down the materials considered important. The student achievement incator is reflected in the results of the post test given after the learning activities.

**Result and Discussion**

Pokeraidof*think-pair-share*trialinfour high schools in Palu attempted to examine aspects related to the teachers’ activities, students’ activities, students’ interest, and students’ achievement after participating in poker aid *think-pair-share*. Table 5.1 shows that at the first trial, the teacher’s activities in all schools have a good rating. While at the second trial, two schools, SMA Negeri 1 Palu and SMA Karuna Dipa Palu had a great achievement. In the third trial all schools showed have good result on the teachers’ implemantation of Poker Aid *Think-pair-share*. There are differences in the quantitative values between one school to another on each trial, but overall there are increasing results in the I, II, and III trials as shown in Table 5.1.

**Table 5.1. Comparison of Teachers’Implementation of Poker Aid *Think-pair-share* of Each School**

No	School	Mean		
		Trial I	Trial II	Trial III
1.	SMAN 1 Palu	84	93	98
2.	S M A N 8 Palu	84	90	94
3.	S M A Karuna D i p a Palu	89	94	98
4.	S M A PGRI 2 Palu	88	90	95

**Source:** Processed from the observation of teachers’ activities at SMAN 1 Palu, SMAN 8 Palu, SMA Karuna Dipa Palu, and SMA PGRI 2 Palu.

Another success indicators were observed in the students’ activity, because an effective learning should encourage

students optimally to the their fullest extent. However, encouraging students is not easy and not all teachers are able to do it well. The poker aid *think-pair-share* can help teachers to encourage students, as shown in table 5.2.

**Table 5.2. Comparison of Students' Activities in the Implementation of Poker Aid Think-pair-share of Each School**

No	School	Mean		
		Trial I	Trial II	Trial III
1.	S M A Negeri 1 Palu	82	87	94
2.	S M A Negeri 8 Palu	83	89	90
3.	S M A Karuna D i p a Palu	87	92	94
4.	S M A PGRI 2 Palu	81	86	88

**Source:** Processed from the observation of students' activities at SMAN 1 Palu, SMAN 8 Palu, SMA Karuna Dipa Palu, and SMA PGRI 2 Palu.

The Table 5.2 result indicates that the students' activities also increased in each trial. In the second trial, SMA Karuna Dipa has reached the best rating, while on the third trial SMA PGRI 2 Palu has got the lowest rank. These results suggest that the lesser students managed in a classroom the better it can encourage students. In SMA Karuna Dipa, the class was divided into 4 groups, while at the other three schools the group was divided into 5 to 8 groups. The observation on the learning process shows

that the drill material volume has been achieved better by SMA Karuna Dipa if its compared to the other shcool, for example, during the poker implementation, the teachers are able to approach each group as much as 6-8 times, while at the other school was only 3-5 times.

The average rate and classical mastery in all pilot schools reflect the students' achievement that can also become the indicator of the development of poker aid *think-pair-share* success. The student achievement, which is the final result of the learning process, has increased. It is proved by all the three trials in those four schools which show that most students exceed the minimum learning mastery standard and classical mastery standard. The mean of students' learning result in each school is as shown on table 5.3

**Table 53. Comparison of Students' Learning Result in the Implementation of Poker Aid Think-pair-share at Each School**

No	School	Trial I	Trial II	Trial III	Mean
1.	S M A Negeri 1 Palu	85,51	87,54	89,57	87,65
2.	S M A Negeri 8 Palu	74,29	74,97	76,56	74,89
3.	S M A Karuna D i p a Palu	86,25	87,12	87,81	87,08
4.	S M A PGRI 2 Palu	69,82	71,07	73,75	71,55

**Source:** Processed by the evaluation result of the student of each school that was given at the end of every trial, 2008.

The research’s subjects schools are set the standard minimum of passing grade the history subject that is set by the research is 65. The results in Table 5.3 show that there are improvement in students’ achievement, because of the three trials results shows that their average grades are above 65, SMA 1 Palu and SMA Karuna Dipa Palu, both have a quite significant improvement.

Students’ achievement results in Table 5.3 had a significant improvement compared to the achievement prior the trials. In SMA Negeri 1 Palu, the mean before the trial was 74.89 after the trial it increased to 87.65; at SMAN 8 Palu, the mean before trial was 64.44 and increased to 74.89; SMA Karuna Dipa, the mean before the trail was 76.12 and it increased to 87.08, and in the SMA PGRI 2 the mean before the trial was 63.32 and it increased to 71.55. The classical mastery achivement is also considered successfull because it has increased above standard, as shown in Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4. Comparison of Classical Mastery in the Implementation of Poker Aid Think-pair-share of Each School**

No	School	Trial I	Trial II	Trial III	Mean
1.	S M A Negeri 1 Palu	94,29%	97,14%	100,00%	97,14%
2.	S M A Negeri 8 Palu	87,50%	93,75%	96,87%	92,71%
3.	S M A Karuna D i p a Palu	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%
4.	S M A PGRI 2 Palu	82,14%	89,29%	89,29%	86,90%

**Source:** Processed by the evaluation result of the student of each school that was given at the end of every trial, 2008.

The results in Table 5.4 show that the average percentage of classical mastery is above the standard of 85%. SMA Karuna Dipa reached 100% at each time trials, while the classical mastery of SMA PGRI 2 Palu during the first trial was below the standard of 82.14%. Based on observations and students’ personal data, there are two students who have not mastered the material, both of them are students who often late for coming to the class because they live quite far from school and should help completing the household chores where they were boarding. It has cause them to always left behind during poker game.

There are 12 indicators observed during the learning activities in each object school. Ten of them are directly related to students’ interest, while the other two are not. Those ten indicators are as follows:

1. *Seriousness* and *focus*, These aspects have increased during the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> trial. In the second and third trials, SMA Karuna Dipa has achieved the maximum result of 100%, while the other schools reached 90%, except SMA Negeri 1 Palu which during the first trial achieved 87.5%. Overall of the implementation in the four sample schools have shown increase toward interest in learning, especially during poker game to identify facts, to understand and explain facts. By palyng this game the students are conditioned to focus on the game of poker.
2. Asking questions and response to friends. More and more students are willing to ask questions, protest and argue against an issue being discussed. It reflects suggests the higher interest

of the students. The study result showed that during the presentation the other students are enthusiastic in providing responds to the student giving presentations. In the first trial, students who show interest is still low, but increased in the second trial and the highest increase in the third trial. The achievement of SMAN 1 Palu student has 8.57% in the first trial and increases to 37.14% on the third trial; at SMAN 8 Palu was 3.12% and increased to 21.87%, SMA Karuna Dipa was 43.75% and increased to 12.50%, while SMA PGRI 2 Palu was 3.57% in the first trial and increased to 21.43% in the third trial. This increase was the result of all teachers' implementation of TPSP on the first and second trials, and more creative in giving motivation for students to actively ask questions and express opinions.

3. Asking questions and response to teacher. After the presentation of several individual students, teachers provided feedback, both on the presentation and the issues that required clarification, then invited the students to ask questions. Based on observations on the first trial there are two schools whose students did not perform these variables, SMAN 8 Palu and SMA PGRI 2 Palu. However, overall, there were significant improvement, in SMAN 1 Palu on the first trial 2.85% and improved to 17, 15% on the third trial, in SMA Karuna Dipa Palu from 12.50% on the first trial improved to 31.25% on the third trial. This result shows that students are interested in poker aid *think-pair-share* method.
4. Responding questions and issues exposed by teacher. During assessment it was obvious that occasionally teachers asked questions that required divergent answers, as the question asked by the teacher at SMAN 1 Palu on the third trials, Why did the Hindu kingdom appear in Kutai earlier, and not in other areas? Why was it not in Java which was earlier influenced by Hindu-Buddhist?. Or as the teacher of SMA PGRI 2 did by asking, "what aspects of Queen Simo (Kingdom of Ho Ling) leadership, Purnawarman (Taruma Kingdom), and Mulawarman (Kutai Kingdom) that are relevant with the current Indonesia? Such questions will inspire students to provide feedback which prove that they are very interested. For example, in SMAN 1 Palu on the first trial 8.57% and increased to 20% in the third trial, as well as in SMA PGRI 2 Palu 3.57% and increased to 14.29% in the third trial. Only a few students who had the opportunity to give comment or convey opinion or question regarding problems posed by the teacher, but other students who had not had the chance still look excited to listen to their friends' opinion.
5. Providing feedback to teacher. This aspect was the lowest aspect. However, overall there were improvement in this indicator. SMAN 1 Palu on the first trial 5.71% and improved to 17.15% in the third trial; SMAN 8 Palu and SMA PGRI 2, there was no students provide feedback at the first trial but improved significantly in the third trial, SMA Karunadipa was 12.5%, and improved to 18.75% in the third trial.
6. *Do not refuse the request to make presentation in front of the class.* Quite a lot of students who spontaneously accept the assignment given by the



teacher to explain the lesson through by presentation in front of the class. Overall, the presentations were ranged between 2 to 6 times at each meeting. However, at first trial apparently teachers are still lack of time of organization for presentation, particularly in SMAN 8 and SMA PGRI 2 Palu. At each school there were 1 or 2 students who refused to do a presentation, especially on the first trial. However, more students are pleased to be a presenter to present their works, so overall students were interested in TPSP. The reason of those students rejected to do presentation might be because they felt unconfident to answer questions during the presentation. It was revealed from the observations when the teacher of SMA PGRI 2 and SMA Negeri 8 asked one of his students for the first presentation, the student refused, fearing that he would not be able to answer the question. This also occurred in SMA 1 Palu and SMA Karuna Dipa Palu, therefore the teachers encouraged them by telling that what required is not the correct answer but their activity. With this kind of motivation, the student finally agreed to do the presentation. The teacher of SMA PGRI 2 chose to use the system in group presentation on the next trial.

7. *Do not refuse to be paired up.* One of the activities that must be performed by the students after playing poker is pair up to share the results of tracking historical facts and explanations. This activity is a characteristic of *think-pair-share*, the interest of doing this activities reached 100% in all schools on the third trial.
8. Excited during sharing partner activity. Once paired, each student is required to

discuss the results of tracking the facts and information, this pushed student to do their sharing excitedly. The results obtained shows that students are eager to share, even reaching 100% in the third trials except SMA PGRI 2 Palu which was only 92.86%. Accordingly, the students' interest were increased in learning history using TPSP.

9. *Eager to follow the presentation.* Associated with the implementation of the presentations made every poker aid *think-pair-share*, it appears that every student showed an excited attitude. Student at SMAN 1 Palu 94.29% were excited in the first trial, and increased to 100% in the second and third trial. In SMA Karuna Dipa, 100% student were excited during the first, second, and third trials. This fact has proven that student are interested in the history lesson using poker aid *think-pair-share* method.
10. Writing down any important facts, particularly the explanation written on the board by the teacher. Teacher should be creative in writing down the important facts on the board, because some teachers' notes on the board can be used as a reference for strengthening the students' answers during evaluation. On the other hand, students will be aware in the importance of copying the teachers' notes listed on the board. The percentage of students who undertake these activities was quite high, especially in SMA 1 Palu and SMA PGRI 2 Palu that was above 90% (except the on the first trials in SMA PGRI 2 Palu, which was 89.29%). In SMA Negeri 8 and SMA Karuna Dipa only in the third trial that was above

90%, the first and the second trial were under 90%. In SMA Karuna Dipa, on the first and second trial, some students did not copy the teachers' notes listed on the board because they considered that they already had the textbook from particular publishers (Erlangga and Tiga Serangkai).

The other two indicators that were categorized as not directly related to the interest were as follows: 1) Interrupting friend/conversing something out of the material's context, especially when playing poker. It is recognized that the application of poker aid *think-pair-share* is not sterile from activities that disrupt the learning process disruptive students or those who chat something out of the material's context, especially when playing poker. This case was found in all schools, but the percentage decreases during the second and third trial, compared with the condition on the first trial. It means that poker aid *think-pair-share* can reduce any disrupting activities during the learning process of history, as well as indicates Students' interest.

Going in and out of the room during class. Students going in and out of the room without any particular reason is often done by students during the teaching process. Before the trial, this indicator was found, but the percentage was getting smaller after the trial. It means, poker aid *think-pair-share* can reduce Students' desire to get out of the room because they are conditioned to follow the game of poker, to interpret facts, to explain, to share, and to do presentation.

## Conclusion

It can be concluded from the research that there are two things that need to be

emphasized: first, students' interest in the history lesson in the four high schools of the research subjects can be improved through applying the poker aid *think-pair-share* model. The indicator of the increased interest are classified into two: the students are more eager to engage in activities that can facilitate learning and decreasing their activities that might obstruct the learning process. Particularly, the students' activities that facilitate the implementation of poker aid *think-pair-share* are:

1. Seriousness and focus but still happy and relaxed while playing poker and do the *think-pair-share*;
2. Asking questions, giving responses, and object to a friend's opinion;
3. Asking questions and giving responses to the teacher;
4. Responding to the questions and issues raised by teacher;
5. Providing feedback to the teacher;
6. Do not refuse when asked to do the presentations;
7. Do not refuse to do the pair up;
8. Excited during the partner sharing activity;
9. Eager to follow the presentation;
10. Writing down any important facts, particularly the explanation written on the board by the teacher.

The activities that might obstruct students' interest in learning process are :

1. Going outside the room during class, especially during poker game.
2. Chating or annoying other student.

*Second*, the students' achievement also improved with the application of *think-pair-share* poker. There are two indicators of the students' improvement and the mean

value of the classical mastery. The means of SMA Negeri 1 Palu was 87.65; SMA Negeri 8 Palu was 74.89; SMA Karuna Dipa was 87.08, and at SMA PGRI 2 was 71.55. The classical mastery was also increased as follows SMA Negeri 1 Palu reached 100% (during the third trial); and SMA Negeri 8 Palu was 96.87% (during the third trial); and SMA Karuna Dipa was 100% (during the first, second, and third trials), and SMA PGRI 2 Palu obtained classical mastery of 89.29% (during the third trial). Eventhough not all schools reach 100% mastery on each trial, but there are an increasing trends from the first, second, and third trials, so that the application of poker aid *think-pair-share* shows a consistency improvement on student achievement.

There are two suggestions to be stated as follows: *first*, the principal should urge teachers, especially teachers of history not to solely use the lecture method, but also using other variation methods, one of which is poker aid *think-pair-share*. And *second*, given the limitations of the first phase product, it is expected that this research can be continued further, so that poker cards produce are more likely increase the students' interest, achievement, and awareness of history.

## REFERENCES

- Adam, A.V. (2001). "Pengendalian Sejarah". Dalam Daniel Dhakidae (Ed). *1000 Tahun Nusantara*. Jakarta: Penerbit Kompas.
- Ali, Moh. R. (1963). *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah Indonesia*. Djakarta : Bhratara.
- Burke, P., (2003), *Sejarah Dan Teori Sosial*, Terjemahan: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Carr, E.H., (1965). *What Is History?*. New York: Macmillagn.
- Daliman, A. (2005). *Perspektif Materi Pendidikan Sejarah yang Ideal*. Socio. 1 (1) 133-127
- Gunning, D. (1999). *The Teaching of History*. London: Cronhelm.
- Hasan, S.H. (2000). *Kurikulum dan Buku Teks Pelajaran Sejarah*. Historia, Vol. I (1), 26.
- Hasan, S. H. (2011). *Pendidikan Sejarah: Orientasi dan Strategi Pedagogis*. Makalah disampaikan pada Konferensi Nasional Sejarah Ke IX, Jakarta 5-7 Juli 2011.
- Hapsari, R. (2006). *Mengajar Sejarah dengan Efektif, Sebuah Pengalaman*. Makalah. disampaikan dalam Mukernas Pengajaran Sejarah, Surabaya 11-13 Juli.
- Hill, Susan & Hill. (1993). *The Colaborative Classroom: A Guide to Cooperative Learning*. Victoria: Elianor Curatain Publishing.
- Hill, C.P. (1956). *Saran-Saran Tentang Mengajarkan Sejarah*. Jakarta: Perpustakaan Perguruan Kementrian P.P & K. Ismaun. (2001). *Paradigma Pendidikan Sejarah yang Terarah dan Bermakna*. Historia, II (4), 99.
- Kartodirdjo, S. (1992), *Pendekatan Ilmu Sosial dalam Metodologi Sejarah*. Jakarta, PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kochhar, S.K. (2008). *Teaching of History*. Terj. Purwanta dan Hardiwati. Yogyakarta: Grasindo.
- Kompas, 13 Agustus 2005
- Kumalasari, D. (2005). *Sejarah dan Problematika Pendidikan*, Historia. Edisi Pertama, 12-13.
- Lie, A. (2004). *Cooperative Learning Mempraktekkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas*. Edisi ketiga. Jakarta: Grasindo.

- Ratumanan, T. G. (2002). *Belajar dan Pembelajaran. Edisi pertama*. Surabaya: Unesa University Press.
- Sanusi. (1992). *Fungsi Pengajaran Sejarah Sebagai Ilmu*. Edisi Pertama. Jakarta: UI- Press.
- Sjamsuddin, H. (1996). *Metodologi Sejarah*. Jakarta: Depdikbud, Proyek Pendidikan Tenaga Akademik.
- Sjamsuddin, H. (2007). *Metodologi Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Ombak.
- Soedjatmoko. (1995). "Sejarawan Indonesia dan Zamanannya," dalam *Historiografi Indonesia: Sebuah Pengantar*. Jakarta, Sugiono. (2008). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan, Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Suhartini, D. (2001). *Minat Siswa Terhadap Topik-topik Mata Pelajaran Sejarah dan beberapa Faktor yang Melatarbelakanginya*. Tesis. Bandung: Program Pascasarjana UPI.
- Surachmad, W. (1978). *Metodologi Pengajaran Nasional 1*. Jakarta: Jenmars
- Sukmadinata, N. (2007). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Umasih. (2006). *Kinerja Guru Sejarah SMA: Beberapa Kasus dari Daerah Pesisir dan Kota Metropolitan*. Makalah. Disampaikan dalam Mukernas Pengajaran Sejarah, Surabaya, 11-13 Juli.
- Surjomihardjo, A. dan Abdullah T. (1998). *Ilmu Sejarah dan Historiografi Arah dan Perspektif*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- Widja, I Gde. (1987). *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah*. Singaraja : FKIP UNUD
- Widja, I Gde. (2002). *Menuju Wajah Baru Pendidikan Sejarah*. Yogyakarta : Laper Pustaka Utama.
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.