



Global Advanced Research Journal of Arts and Humanities (GARJAH) Vol. 2(2) pp. 014-019, March 2013
Available online <http://garj.org/garjah/index.htm>
Copyright © 2013 Global Advanced Research Journals

Full Length Research Paper

Students' preferences in learning history

Rosy Talin

School of Education and Social Development, University Malaysia Sabah

Email: rostalin@gmail.com

Accepted 03 March, 2013

There are many studies referring to improving the teaching of History in the classroom but less emphasis was given to study what students' think about the teaching and what they actually preferred. This study investigates students' preferences in the teaching and learning History. This study adopts the qualitative techniques and was carried out in rural secondary schools. The participants of this study were 16 secondary school students aged 16 years old. They were interviewed before and after an observed History lesson as to understand their preferences in learning History. The finding showed that these participants preferred learning History through seeing, doing and hearing. To put in Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory these participants were a mixture of auditory, visual and kinesthetic learners. As for the teaching activities these participating students preferred 'hands-on' and fun activities, sense of humour, and visual presentation of content and notes instead of the traditional way of teaching the subject. This finding proves there was a gap in the teaching of History between what the students preferred with what was offered by the teachers. This explains why History was marked as a boring subject among students.

Keywords: Learning of History, Teaching of History, Students Preferences.

INTRODUCTION

History is one of the subjects being taught in schools around the world, including Malaysia. This subject has a special feature as compared to other subjects in the curriculum. It is the only subject that deals with facts about the past. The past is important for today's life because it serves as a source of experience, evidence and analogy to explain events happening around; sharpens intuitions and insights in dealing with those events; and prepares people for future events. If someone said history has nothing to do with him or her, he or she is making a profound error (Lowenthal, 2000). It is the history that creates who we are today, thus, history needs to be studied in order to avoid previous mistakes

and to gain a better understanding of the events happening around and in the future.

The awareness of the importance of history in one's life has brought the Malaysian Ministry of Education to upgrade History subject as a core subject in the education curriculum. Such move has been materialized with the implementation of the Integrated Curriculum for Secondary Schools (ICSS) since in 1989. Under this curriculum, it is compulsory for every student in secondary schools to learn History. The purpose of the History education is to produce historically knowledgeable and empathetic students. To achieve such purpose, the History syllabus has gone through

several improvements to ensure the content is reliable to create knowledgeable and empathetic students and the teaching of History should be geared towards supporting the purpose. The Inquiry Teaching Method has been suggested to be implemented in the teaching of History in the classroom (PusatPerkembanganKurikulum, 2003).

Literature review

Cooper and McIntyre's (1996) study of effective classroom learning in English and History, in the United Kingdom for Year 7 pupils, revealed the most enjoyable teaching activities preferred by the students were storytelling, discussion, question and answer, group and pair work, drama and role playing, and the use of mental stimulation. Besides that, debates and discussions, stories about famous people, videos, individual or group investigative work and fieldwork were also identified as interesting approaches to be implemented in teaching of History (Dilek and Yacipi, 2005). The results of a survey done in the U.S by Rosenzweig and Thelan in 1994 (Rosenzweig, 2000) revealed that students of all types demonstrate a widespread engagement with the past, particularly if they can do it first-hand, confronting direct historical evidence and constructing their own historical narratives. These findings showed that the main reason for the practices to be preferred was students' involvement in the process. This indicates that students' involvement in the teaching and learning practice in today's classroom is highly preferred.

However, research done by Borries (2000) in Germany explained that "open", "innovative", "modern", "student-centered", and "autonomous" strategies of teaching history were not commonly used. Teachers in his research were more comfortable adopting the conventional ways of teaching. Although the conventional strategies of teaching history cannot be proven empirically to be superior to "open", "innovative", "modern", "student-centered", and "autonomous" strategies, but the conventional way was more preferred. The conventional way of teaching includes memorization, dictation, relying on the textbook as the key to knowledge, and one-way questioning. The teachers' task was to present the knowledge in a given time frame and the students engage in note taking during the teaching and learning session (Larson et al., 1998; Borries, 2000; Demircioglu, 2001). The conventional way of teaching is also called the traditional teaching. This teaching is still popularly used in many schools today (Borries, 2000).

Boix-Mansilla (2000) commented although schools teach some sort of history to their students almost every day, the schools ignored dealing with interpreting the historical facts. Research about teaching history in classrooms indicated the primary concern in the teaching of history was consuming and reproducing events and

details find mostly in the textbook, therefore, the interpretation practice did not exist (Barton, 2001; VanSledright, 2002; Seixas, 1999). The standard textbooks, combined with lectures delivered by teachers, were considered definitive. Tests measure the results. The obsession appeared to be with the products of historical study, not with the practice of doing it. Therefore, children seldom, if ever, explicitly encounter the interpretive practice.

These abroad literatures findings were matched with the local literatures findings. Thus, it can be said that the conventional way of teaching History was preferred by most History teachers. This scenario has encouraged me to study students' preferences to understand their opinion towards the teaching of History in the classroom today. Furthermore, Giroux (2003) acknowledged that children have fewer rights than almost any other group and fewer institutions protecting these rights. Consequently, their voices and needs have been, and still are, almost completely absent from the debates, policies, and legislative practices that were constructed in terms of their needs. In recent years, specifically in Western countries, there has been an increasing move towards listening to the voices of students in schools and colleges (Flutter and Rudduck, 2004). This has resulted partly from legal changes which have served to increase the rights of children as consumers, and partly from an increasing number of teachers who were beginning to see the benefits of consulting children about issues that directly and indirectly affects them in their school or college life (Diaz et al. 2008; Frost and Holden, 2008).

The argument

Previous studies on the teaching of History found that lecturing was widely adopted by History teachers in Malaysia (Jasbir, 1985; Rohana, 1987; PutehMohamad, 1992; Aini, 1998). The finding was supported by the School Inspectorates report which concluded that teacher-centre teaching method was dominantly used in the teaching of History (Subadrah and Malar, 2005). Although the Inquiry Teaching Method was suggested in the curriculum since 2003, most literatures on the teaching of History still reported that History was taught using techniques such as explanation and storytelling (Tor GeokHwa, 2004; Michele and Noor Hafizah, 2005; and Azwan et al, 2005). The dominant figure in these techniques was the teachers and the students became passive learners. Recent research (Rosy, 2011) showed that such teaching is still prevalent in the teaching of History today. As a result, students perceived History as a boring subject. There were many studies on improving the teaching of History. From these studies, approaches, methods and techniques were suggested (Subadrah and Malar, 2005; Zahara and

Nurliah, 2009; Sengul, 2010). However, there was less emphasized given on students' preferences in learning History. Students' preference is equally important to be known as this will give ideas for teachers to match their way of teaching History in the classroom with the students' preferences to make the teaching effective.

The purpose

Based on the argument above, this study intends to answer the following questions

- a. What are students' preferences in learning History
- b. How do students prefer History to be taught?

As such, the objectives of this study are as follows:

- a. To reveal students' preferences in learning History
- b. To discover students' preferences in teaching History.

THE METHODOLOGY

The qualitative design was adopted in this study. The data were collected through observation of the participants' activities in the classroom, interviews with the participants before and after the observation, and review of relevant documents to support the data gathered from observations and interviews. The participants were 16 from four students, aged 16 years old, from four classes in four different rural secondary schools in Sabah, Malaysia. They were grouped according to their school. These students from these schools were involved to get wider data on students' preferences in learning and teaching History. The students selected were all moderate students in term of their achievement in History subject.

The data collection process began with the familiarization interviews. In these interviews I got to know the participants, explained the purpose and procedures of the study, obtained participants' consent to be observed and set appointments for the data collection activities. In each classroom observation, I video recorded the whole teaching jotted down all the information needed based on the observation protocol. Concentration of the observations was on the participants. After the observation, the data collection proceeded to the post-observation interviews with the participants. The data from the observations were clarified and probed in the interviews to get more in-depth data. Each interview lasted between thirty to forty five minutes. All interviews were recorded using the digital voice recording. As a backup, notes were also taken during the interviews. The review of relevant documents available was done after the post-observation interviews. Information from the reviews of these documents was also included in the field notes.

Data analysis

The data collected were analyzed immediately after each fieldwork. The interviews were transcribed, read and coded; the video recordings were viewed and counter checked with the field notes; and notes from the documents reviewed were checked to get additional information. The open coding activity was used in the analysis. The insights, ideas, and hunches from the data were identified and coded and were brought back to the participants for validation, addition or modification. In this stage I discussed with the participants whether they agreed with the codes identified from the data collected. The participants' comments were noted. This led to refinement and reformulation of the information to produce believable and trustworthy findings.

The data was analyzed using the within-case analysis and cross-case analysis. In within-case analysis, I analyzed all the data collected from each group and wrote an individual report. The axial coding was used in this analysis. The codes were put together in subcategories and categories and their relationship were identified. The aim was to make explicit explanation about the data collected from each group.

The individual report was then crossed checked in the cross-case analysis to draw a conclusion about the students' preferences. In this analysis the selective coding was used. This coding involved the process of selecting and identifying the core category based on the data from the individual report. It was followed by developing the interpretation of the study to understand the students' preferences as a whole. The final process was writing the full report of this study.

It is worth to mention that this study was not based on any advance assumptions or variables about the issues to be investigated. The intent of this study was to uncover the variables from the data, thus, the variables recognized at the end of the data analysis were as followed.

THE FINDING

The analysis identified several categories to explain students' preferences in learning History. Those categories are presented below.

Learning preferences

Data from cross-case analysis showed the students were mixed learners. They were visual learners, as well as the auditory learners and the kinesthetic learners.

All the participating students revealed they preferred learning through seeing things. They wished their teachers visualized the notes through mind mapping and explained to them using power point. They disapproved

the wordy notes. These students commented wordy notes made them feel sleepy in the class. Such disapproval indicated these students were visual learners (Gardner, 1983; Sparkes, 1999).

This finding also showed these students preferred teachers to involve them in the teaching process. They preferred presentation and activities that required them to search for the main points of the topic given. They revealed such activities allowed them to have 'hands-on' experience as they have the opportunity to share the teacher's feeling in preparing the lesson. These students also requested teachers to have extra teaching and learning activities, such as visits, and quizzes. Such requests indicated that these students preferred some fun activities to be carried out in the learning process. There was a much greater sense of learning with a single site visit than with large number of textbooks in class. This preference indicated the criteria of a kinesthetic learner. This type of learners enjoyed learning if they were physically involved in the process (Dunn and Dunn, 1992).

Although they preferred activities mentioned above but they did not deny the teachers' current teaching practice. They insisted such practice provided them with factual knowledge, allowed them to share information and received feedbacks from friends. These students admitted they still need such teaching practice because it prepared them for the examination. This data revealed that these students were auditory learners. They preferred teachers to give explanation on important points.

As a whole, the participating students' preference revealed they were a mixture of visual, auditory and kinesthetic learners. Therefore, they preferred teaching approach that matching with their learning preferences. This finding confirmed Gardner's Multiple Intelligences theory which said that students learn based on their multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983).

Teaching preferences

Based on the participating students' learning preferences, the cross-case analysis showed they preferred two teaching approaches to be considered in their teacher's teaching practice. Those approaches were the eclectic approach, and the blended approach.

Eclectic approach

The data showed the eclectic approach was the students' preferred teaching approach. They preferred the teacher to ask questions frequently during the explanation session. Such act was seen as an effort to detect students' understanding of the topic and to keep them alert. Besides, this was also perceived as allowing them to share information and to get immediate feedback from

their friends and teacher. The students said they understood the topic if the teacher provided the correct answers for the questions if they could not get the answer. They also preferred the teacher to re-explain the topic to ensure they understood the topic taught. These findings showed the teacher-centered approach was still relevant.

The data collected also showed the students preferred their teachers to give them exercises and instructed them to close their textbook and notebook when answering the exercises. They perceived such a way trained them to think and to recall important points stored in their short term memory. They also preferred the practice of allowing them to look for the main points of the topic learnt. This encouraged them to become self-learners. This showed these students preferred student-centered approach.

Clearly, those suggestions indicated that these students preferred a mixture of teacher and students centered approaches, thus, it fulfilled the characteristic of the eclectic approach. This approach was seen as helping students to acquire and enhance their understanding of the topic, stimulate their thinking, and most importantly prepare them for the examination. Indirectly, this finding indicates these students rejected the widely used of teacher-centered approach.

Besides the face-to-face activities in the eclectic approach, the cross-case analysis data also showed these students preferred the use of technology to enhance the teaching effectiveness. Such combination was known as the blended approach (Graham, 2006).

Blended approach

As shown by the data, there were two groups of the participating students preferred their teacher to use devices such as computer, TV and radio in the teaching process. They saw this technology would enhance their understanding of the topic taught. This students' preference was matched with Hisham et al., (2006) who said teaching with the help of technology improved students' performance. These students revealed that using devices in the teaching process enhanced their understanding because they had a chance to see, read, browsed for additional information about the topic and shared the information in the power point presentation. Power point presentations were more attractive because it came with beautiful colours and illustrations. This improved students' acquisition of the points. This finding showed that these groups of students preferred the electronic innovations to be combined in the teaching of History.

This finding indicated the students were ready to be taught using the blended approach where the traditional way of teaching was still needed but with the enhancement from the use of technology to make the

learning process more interesting. This also indicated that more teaching software for this subject is needed to be developed.

In sum, the cross-case analysis findings in this section revealed that these students preferred multiple approaches to be used in the teaching of History in the classroom. This finding concurred with the findings that the students were a mixture of learners therefore the teaching approach need to meet these learners' preferences. If teachers are not able to compile these preferences, students may not be able to learn History effectively in the classroom. Research had also shown that a mismatch between teachers' teaching approach and students' learning preferences lead to ineffectiveness in teaching (Lixin, 2006).

DISCUSSION

The teaching practice of History as revealed in this study was not fully preferred by the students. The findings showed there was a mismatch between what had been practiced by the teachers with what the students preferred. The mismatch occurred because these students were a mixture of visual, auditory and kinesthetic learners. This finding conformed to Gardner's Multiple Intelligences theory (Gardner, 1999). The data about the current teaching practice showed it primarily catered the learning preferences of the auditory learners only. This explained why History is often perceived as a boring subject in school. Obviously, this finding required changes in these teachers' teaching practice. They need to comply with the students' preferences to help students learn and understand History better.

The finding of this study also showed that students prefer to be asked. For them questions created curiosity in their mind. Curiosity tended to motivate students to look or ask for the answers. This encouraged students to acquire for the answer. Such preference need to be fulfilled by these teachers. They should emphasize the 4W and 1H questions in their teaching. Teachers have to plan a well-developed series of questions and use them in their teaching to deliver the content. It has been suggested that if questions are carefully framed, the answers received is not merely a memorization of facts, but also exercising one or more of the higher level cognitive skills in the Bloom's taxonomy; to analyze, to synthesize, and to evaluate.

At present, as reported by the teachers in this study, they seldom have the opportunity to go to any courses related to teaching of History. Consequently, they continued teaching as what they have been doing before because it allowed them to prepare students for the examination. Teachers should be given the opportunity to follow any professional development on this matter. They

should also be given the opportunity to use technology as much as the opportunity given to other subjects. Teachers need this equipment to teach History interestingly and meaningfully as foreseen by the students.

To conclude, the effort of improving the teaching and learning practice should be borne by all parties concerned with the teaching of History. The authority, the education institution, the teachers, and the students should all work hand-in-hand to make changes. In a centralized system of education any changes to be made has to be initiated by the authority through a policy. The policy needs to be disseminated to educational institutions which play a part in teachers' education or training. These institutions translated the policy in the form of professional development to train teachers. A professional development mechanism could provide insights to teachers to improve their teaching practice as what they have been practicing now was not really preferred by students. It is useful to refresh teachers' knowledge and skills in teaching (Yamagata-Lynch and Haudenschild, 2008). Indeed, these recommendations required more studies and take much time before they can be materialized. Such studies may help in upgrading the teaching of this subject to prepare students to pass the subject in 2013. If this issue is not tackled properly the intention to develop more holistic and responsible citizen through the teaching of History will not be achieved.

CONCLUSION

It would be easier to list the problems in the teaching of these experienced History teachers and make a pessimistic picture of what was happening in secondary school classrooms where history was concerned. However, the intention of this study, from the beginning was to understand the students' preferences in learning History. The way History was taught had left students' unsatisfied. The students offered some suggestions for improvement, which from their suggestions showed some transition in their needs that required accommodation from the teachers. The students had shown their readiness to be asked frequent questions, inclusive of questions outside the topic taught. The students had also showed their need to be given the space to manage their own learning through student-centered activities. Inevitably, teachers are required to make proper planning for the lesson to avoid wasting opportunities and to make teaching more effective. It is not too late for teachers to cultivate and nourish students' innate curiosity about the past. Well taught history classes should not only provide students with the historical knowledge alone but should also help students to develop their historical thinking skills, attitudes and values towards becoming more empathetic or sensitive citizens. The foundation deve-

loped at the student's young age will help the teachers to produce citizens with holistic manners in efforts to fulfill the aim of History education.

REFERENCES

- Aini H (1998). Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Sejarah di Sekolah: Gurusebagai Broker Ilmu Sejarah. Paper presented in Simposium Sejarah, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, 30 – 31 Oktober.
- Azwan A, Abdul GA, Mohammad ZA, Abd RA (2005). Kesan Efikasi Kendiri Guru Sejarah Terhadap Amalan Pengajaran Berbantuan Teknologi Maklumat dan Komunikasi (ICT). *Journal Penyelidikan Pendidikan*. Vol. 7, pp14-27.
- Barton K (2001). Primary children's understanding of the role of historical evidence: Comparisons between the United States and Northern Ireland. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*. 1(2). (Online Journal)
- Boix-Mansilla V (2000). Historical Understanding: Beyond and the Past and into the Present. In Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P., and Wineburg, S. (eds.) *Knowing Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. New York: New York Press. Pp 391–415.
- Borries BV (2000). Methods and Aims of Teaching History in Europe : A Report on Youth and History. In Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P., and Wineburg, S. (eds.) *Knowing Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. New York: New York Press. Pp 246 – 261.
- Cooper P, McIntyre D (1996) *Effective Teaching and Learning: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Demircioglu IH (2001). Does the Teaching of History in Turkey Need Reform?. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 2(1). Online Journal.
- Diaz A, Middendorf J, Pace D, Shopkow L (2008). The History Learning Project: A Department "Decodes" its Students. *The Journal of American History*. March : 1211-1224. Online Journal.
- Dilek D, Yapici G (2005). The Use of Stories in the Teaching of History. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*. 5 (2). Online Journal.
- Drake F, Brown SD (2003). A Systematic Approach to Improve Students' Historical Thinking. *The History Teacher*. 36(4). Online Journal.
- Dunn R, Dunn K (1992). Teaching elementary students through their individual learning styles: practical approaches for grades 3-6. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Felder RM, Brent R (2003). Learning by Doing. *Chemical Engineering Education*. 37(4): 282–283. North Carolina State University: Raleigh, NC. Online Journal.
- Flutter J, Rudduck J (2004). *Consulting Pupils: What's in it for Schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Frost R, Holden G (2006). Student Voice and Future Schools: Building Partnership for Student Participation. *Improving School*. 11(1): 83-95.
- Gardner H (1993). *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*, New York: Basic Books.
- Giroux H (2003). Public time and educated hope: educational leadership and the war against youth. <http://www.units.mnhoio.edu/eduleadership/anthology/OA/OA03001.html>. Retrieved 8 May 2006].
- Graham C (2006). "Blended Learning Systems: Definitions, Current Trends, and Future Directions," in *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs*, edited by Bonk, C. & Graham, C. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Pp 3-21.
- Hisham D, Che SM, Hassan AB (2006). Moving Forward with Blended Learning (BL) as a Pedagogical Alternative to Traditional Classroom Learning. *Malaysian Online Journal of Instructional Technology (MOJIT)*. 3(1): 11-18
- Jasbir SS (1985). *Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Sejarah di Sekolah-sekolah Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publication
- Larsson Y, Matthews R, Booth M (2004). The Teaching and Learning of History for 15-16 year olds: Have the Japanese Anything to Learn From the English Experience? *Teaching History*. London. 114:37-45.
- Lixin X (2006). Bridging the Gap Between Teaching Styles and Learning Styles: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. *TESL EJ*. 10(3). <http://www.teslej.org/ej39/a2.html>.
- Lowenthal D (2000). Dilemmas and Delights of Learning History. In Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P., and Wineburg, S. (eds) *Knowing Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. New York : New York Press. Pp 63-82.
- Michele TML, Noor Hafizah MR (2005). Penggunaan Peta Konsep bagi Meningkatkan Prestasi Mata Pelajaran Sejarah Tingkatan Dua. http://apps.emoe.gov.my/jnperak/kajian/2005/laporan/kemanusiaan/6_kinta_michele_ting_hing.pdf. Retrieved 21 November 2007.
- Patton MQ (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA; Sage Publication
- Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum (2003). *Huraian Sukatan Pelajaran Sejarah Tingkatan 4*. Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Puteh (1992). "Beberapa Pandangan Ke Arah Meningkatkan Keberkesanan Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Sejarah Menjelang Abad ke 21" dalam *Aliran dan Amalan Pendidikan*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publication
- Ritchie J, Lewis J (2003). *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Sciences Students and Researchers*. London: Sage Publication.
- Rohana Z (1987). *Aplikasi Teknologi dalam Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Sejarah: Kesedaran Masalahnya*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publication.
- Rosenzweig R (2000). How Americans Use and Think about the Past: Implications from a National Survey for the Teaching of History. In Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P., and Wineburg, S. (eds) *Knowing Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. New York : New York Press. Pp 262 – 283.
- Rosy T (2011). *The Teaching and Learning of History in Rural Secondary School*. Unpublished Phd Theses.
- Seixas P (1993). The community of inquiry as a basis for knowledge and learning: The case of history. *American Educational Research Journal*. 30(2). pp 305-324.
- Silverman D (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage Publication.
- Sparkes JJ (1999). Learning-Centred Teaching. *European Journal of Engineering Education*. 24(2). pp 183-188.
- Subadrah N, Malar M (2005). Penggunaan Model Konstruktivisme Lima Fasa Needham Dalam Pembelajaran Sejarah. *Malaysian Journal of Educators and Education*. 20. pp 21-41.
- Tor GH (2004). Masalah Pembelajaran Sejarah: Satu Kajian Tindakan. [http://www.psb1.uum.edu.my/TESES/Penyelidikan n%20Print/2005/TOR%20GEOK%20HWA.pdf](http://www.psb1.uum.edu.my/TESES/Penyelidikan%20Print/2005/TOR%20GEOK%20HWA.pdf) Retrieved 30 August 2007.
- Tuba S (2010). Activity Models about Using Drama Method in History Lessons. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences* 2: 3155-3159. Elsevier Ltd.
- Van Sledright B (2002). Confronting History's Interpretive Paradox While Teaching Fifth Graders. *American Educational Research Journal*. 39(4). Pp 1089-1115. Online Journal.
- White PL (2002). Reflections on Forty-Odd years of Teaching History and on Training Prospective PhDs to Do So. *The History Teacher*. 35(4). Online Journal.
- Yamagata-Lynch LC, Haudenschild MT (2008). Using activity system analysis to identify inner contradictions in teacher professional Development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. Online Journal.
- Zahara A, Nurliah J (2009). Penggunaan Peta Konsep untuk Meningkatkan Pencapaian Mata Pelajaran Sejarah bagi Pelajar Tingkatan Dua. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia* 34(1): 3-15