



Oral History in Indonesian History Textbooks: From the 2013 Curriculum to the *Kurikulum Merdeka*

Aditya Nugroho Widiadi^{1*}, Indah Wahyu Puji Utami², Moch Nizam Alfahmi³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
aditya_widiadi@um.ac.id

Abstract. This study aims to examine the position of oral history in history subjects in Indonesia. The study was conducted through a qualitative analysis of the curriculum documents and official textbooks of the last two curricula, namely the 2013 Curriculum and the Independent Curriculum (*Kurikulum Merdeka*). This study is important to do because so far there has been an old paradigm that considers that history only depends on written sources, such as the adage 'without documents, there is no history'. Such a condition is ultimately reflected in historiographical works in Indonesia—and also around the world—which tend to rely on written sources and overlook oral sources. In fact, oral sources have an important role in reconstructing the past from a more humanistic and equitable perspective. The findings of this study indicate that there is a shift in the position of oral history in the two curricula, but unfortunately it has not been absolutely integrated because it has not equipped students with what oral history is and how to conduct research using oral history.

Keywords: Oral History, History Textbooks, Kurikulum 2013, Kurikulum Merdeka.

1 Introduction

History is a discipline that critically reconstructs events that occurred in the past using historical traces left behind, both written and artefactual. In addition, history can also be reconstructed through the testimony of perpetrators and eyewitnesses who were directly present, saw or just heard the occurrence of a disaster. The reconstruction process must be based on empirical evidence that is scientifically studied through the method of critical historical research [1], [2]. Without critically examining both primary and secondary historical sources, narratives of the past lack a strong evidentiary basis and may become mere myths and fairy tales [3]. Therefore, the availability of reliable historical sources is the main foundation that historians use to construct objective and scientifically sound historiography.

Unfortunately, for a long time, academic historiographical tradition tended to place too much emphasis on written sources as the sole basis of the most reliable historical knowledge. This view is reflected in the phrase, "no documents, no history," which is often associated with the statement of Leopold von Ranke, a Western historian from the nineteenth century [4], [5], [6], [7]. The dominance of this kind of view has led to the marginalization of other forms of historical evidence, including

oral sources. In fact, oral sources have great potential to be used in reconstructing the past from the perspective of the personal experiences of historical actors and witnesses. At the same time, dismissing oral sources means neglecting the collective memory of communities, as well as the perspectives of marginalized groups, which often never appear in official documents produced by the authorities [8], [9], [10], [11], [12].

As a logical consequence of the reliance on written records, oral history has been excluded from its use in a wide range of global historiographical works [13]. This situation can also be observed in Indonesian historiographical works, which tend not to give sufficient attention to oral history [14]. Modern Indonesian historiographical writing is still dominated by the use of written sources from colonial archives, official state documents, newspaper archives, and the like. More importantly, this disregard for oral history not only narrows the scope of the national historical narrative, but also implicitly ignores local narratives and the testimonies of grassroots historical actors.

This article argues that the imbalance in historical writing is greatly influenced by the application of history education in formal educational institutions, particularly schools and universities, which tend to ignore the teaching of oral history. In the Indonesian context, the reality on the ground suggests that history education in schools more often focuses on memorizing facts from textbooks and official historiography of the state [15]. Students have not been equipped with a basic oral history methodology as a tool to practice critical analysis skills. The absence or limitation of the integration of oral history into teaching and learning in this classroom ultimately reinforces the perception that oral sources are an inferior form of evidence, while at the same time leading to the inhibition of students' active involvement in exploring the local historical narratives that exist around them [16].

Based on the various problems mentioned above, this study aims to conduct an in-depth analysis of the position of oral history in the Indonesian history education curriculum policy, as well as conduct a comparative analysis of the oral history portion in school history textbooks. In particular, this study intends to examine the paradigm shift from the 2013 Curriculum (*Kurikulum 2013*) [17], [18], [19], [20], which emphasizes a scientific approach, toward the 'Independent Curriculum' (*Kurikulum Merdeka*), which emphasizes flexibility of learners [21]. Content analysis was carried out based on learning objectives and teaching materials in both curricula and mentions of oral history in textbooks. Ultimately, this article aims to uncover the extent to which oral history is recognized and integrated into history education in Indonesia.

The significant benefit of this study lies in the need to examine how Indonesian history education policies deal with long-rooted old paradigms. As long as the position of oral history remains marginalized in the classroom, students will only gain an incomplete understanding of history as a result of being accustomed to seeing written sources as the only valid form of evidence. As a result, the younger generation will miss out on the opportunity to develop a historical consciousness rooted in local realities and collective community experiences. Limiting the historical narrative to only written documents and official government texts will only distort students' understanding of the complexities of the past. Therefore, analyzing the position of oral history in the national curriculum is essential to encourage an inclusive and

democratic pedagogical transformation, while also equipping students with historical thinking skills through critical investigation of oral sources.

In contemporary discourse, scholarly works on historiographical writing and historical education in Indonesia seem to be on two different paths. On the one hand, historiographic studies have consistently questioned the hegemony of colonial archives and centralized state narratives [22], [23], [24], although these archives and narratives remain widely used in various national historiographic works. On the other hand, research in history education has focused primarily on the effectiveness of alternative learning strategies or the evaluation of student outcomes [15], [21], [25], [26], [27]. Studies that specifically examine the convergence of these two domains—that is, the position of oral history both as a methodology and as substantive content in official curriculum documents—are still very limited, especially those offering a comparative analysis of the paradigm shift from the 2013 Curriculum to the *Kurikulum Merdeka*. Therefore, the novelty of this study lies in its focus on evaluating how changes in national curriculum policies directly affect the position and portion of oral history in the curriculum and history textbooks.

Based on the background mapping, this study aims to meet three main objectives. First, identify the learning objectives, scope, and proportions of weight given to oral history in the 2013 Curriculum and related official student textbooks. Second, identify the learning objectives, scope, and proportion of weight given to oral history accommodated in the *Kurikulum Merdeka* and its official textbooks. Third, interpret the pedagogical implications of this curriculum shift in placing oral history in history teaching at the high school level in Indonesia.

2 Method

To answer the three main objectives above, this study uses a qualitative document analysis approach through library research [28]. The analysis is carried out systematically across two different sets of official educational materials: the official curriculum documents and textbooks for Grades 10–12 under the 2013 Curriculum (Core Competencies and Basic Competencies), along with the Merdeka Curriculum (Learning Outcomes) documents and the corresponding Phase E and F textbooks [29], [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36]. Treating these national documents as primary qualitative data, this study traces shifts in the policies and pedagogical frameworks that govern how historical methodology is formally conceptualized and translated into school teaching.

The analytical framework uses qualitative content analysis [37] to evaluate and compare the two curriculum documents across three aspects: learning objectives, text representation, and instructional direction. Following the data reduction and comparative matrix display as outlined by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana [38], the study tracked the proportion of textbook content dedicated to oral sources, the extent to which oral history is treated as substantive content and whether there is a research methodology based on oral history. Through this comparative synthesis, this method uncovers the structural position of oral history in the national curriculum and assesses its ability to develop students' historical thinking skills through oral history.

3 Finding and Discussion

Based on the analysis of the official curriculum documents and history textbooks from the Indonesian government, it is known that the position of oral history in Indonesian history education is different between the 2013 Curriculum and the *Kurikulum Merdeka*. However, this change should not be understood simply as a linear shift from the absence to the existence of oral history. Rather, it is a form of shift in how oral sources are positioned in the subject of history in Indonesia. In the 2013 Curriculum, the opportunity for students to interact with historical sources is mainly embedded in broad procedural competencies, such as knowing, questioning, collecting data, reasoning, and communicating through the implementation of simple historical research. However, the curriculum does not explicitly identify oral history as a particular source or research method. This implicit position is also increasingly reflected in official textbooks: oral history is only briefly mentioned in Grade X textbooks, but then disappears from historical narratives and learning activities in Grades XI and XII. As a result, although the curriculum provides pedagogical spaces and opportunities for students to conduct historical research, textbooks do not translate this space in relation to oral sources.

A different tendency can be observed in the *Kurikulum Merdeka*. The learning outcomes in Grade X explicitly require students to develop investigative skills through the stages of historical research—heuristic, criticism, interpretation, and historiography—and the textbook provides more explicit references to written, material (artefactual), and oral sources. Specifically, Grade X textbooks identify oral sources as one of the three major categories of historical sources and repeatedly mention oral information as part of the heuristic process. The rest, in Grade XI, oral history is not mentioned at all, and in Grade XII it is only mentioned as one of the reference sources. Nevertheless, the presence of stronger oral sources in the *Kurikulum Merdeka* does not necessarily indicate that oral history has become a fully developed methodology of school history education. On the contrary, the evidence suggests a movement from implicit recognition to the recognition of explicit sources, while the methodological and pedagogical dimensions of oral history are still underdeveloped.

3.1 Oral History in the 2013 Curriculum

The analysis of the 2013 Curriculum indicates that oral history was not explicitly formulated as either a historical source or a methodological approach. Nevertheless, the curriculum contained several competencies that potentially created space for its incorporation into history learning. This is stated in the third and fourth Core Competencies (*Kompetensi Inti* or KI), KI-3 required students to understand, apply, and analyse factual, conceptual, and procedural knowledge, while KI-4 required them to process, reason, and present knowledge in both concrete and abstract domains and to employ methods consistent with scholarly principles [39]. These competencies were reinforced by several Basic Competencies (*Kompetensi Dasar* or KD) that required students to undertake historical research or produce historical narratives. For example, Grade XI KD 4.6 required students to write the history of a national and regional figure who struggled against colonialism. Grade XII KD 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6

required students to conduct simple research into Indonesia's political and economic life during the Guided Democracy, New Order, and early Reformasi periods and present the results in written reports [39]. In principle, these competencies could accommodate oral history because historical research involving contemporary or local actors can legitimately employ interviews as primary sources. However, the curriculum stopped at the level of generic historical inquiry and did not specify oral history as one of the methods through which these competencies could be achieved.

This analysis of the affordability and specificity of the curriculum is important because what is expected sometimes has a disparity with what is applied, between the intended vis-à-vis implemented curriculum [27]. The 2013 curriculum does not mention the prohibition of the use of oral history or oral sources; rather, its use is largely left to the interpretation and initiative of the teacher as the spearhead. As a result, the potential for oral history does exist but is not institutionally articulated. In fact, the curriculum's emphasis on the scientific approach (*pendekatan saintifik*) can be a strong foundation for oral history to use if teachers explicitly encourage their students to understand the past through a process of interview, source criticism, and interpretation as a procedure of historical inquiry. It must be understood that oral history is not just about collecting people's memories [9], [11]. Professional oral history practice requires rigorous procedures, starting with preparation, informed consent, selection of the right narrator, interviews, storage, and compilation of historiography. The absence of such methodological specification in the curriculum is a missed opportunity to link the scientific approach in the 2013 Curriculum with the methodological possibilities of oral history.

Analysis of textbooks provides stronger evidence about the marginal position of oral history in history education in Indonesia. For example, in Grade X textbooks [30], oral sources are mentioned in discussions about the early arrival of Islam in Papua. The textbook [30] states that, according to oral traditions inherited by the descendants of the kings of Raja Ampat-Sorong, Fakfak, Kaimana, and Teluk Bintuni-Manokwari, Islam had arrived in the region relatively earlier. One version records the arrival of 1360 and relates the information to oral records given by Muhamad Sidik Bauw, the sixteenth King of Rumbati, and H. Ismail Samali Bauw, the seventeenth King of Rumbati. This is important because textbooks recognize oral testimony as a basis for constructing historical records that are not entirely derived from written records. At the same time, this example must be conceptually distinguished from oral history in a strict methodological sense. This history deals with oral traditions that are passed down through generations [40], while oral history generally refers to recorded interviews with narrators selected based on their knowledge or experience of a particular historical subject. Therefore, this textbook shows recognition of oral sources, but not necessarily the teaching of oral history as a research practice.

More importantly, this recognition is not maintained at all subsequent levels. The Grade XI and Grade XII textbooks analyzed in this study did not contain a substantial discussion of oral history or oral sources as part of the students' historical investigation. This creates a considerable gap between the ideally oriented competencies of scientific research established by the curriculum and the reality of the learning resources available to students. Students are expected to conduct simple historical research, but textbooks do not systematically introduce them to the various

sources that can be used to conduct such research, especially oral sources. The result is a form of procedural openness without methodological scaffolding [41]: students may be asked to conduct research, but not consistently taught how oral testimony can be identified, collected, evaluated, and interpreted as historical evidence.

3.2 Oral History in the Kurikulum Merdeka

The position of oral history becomes more visible in the *Kurikulum Merdeka*, particularly through its emphasis on historical inquiry. The Grade X learning outcome requires students to develop inquiry skills through the stages of historical research: heuristics, criticism, interpretation, and historiography [42]. Although the formulation does not explicitly state that students must use oral sources, the reference to historical inquiry necessarily expands the range of possible evidence beyond textbook narratives. This is reflected in the Grade X textbooks [36], where oral sources are explicitly incorporated into discussions of historical methodology.

The Grade X History for SMK textbook [35], for example, introduces Herodotus as an early historian who used different forms of evidence, including observation, inscriptions, and oral accounts. More importantly, when explaining historical research based on Louis Gottschalk [35], the textbook identifies the first stage of historical research as collecting relevant written and oral information. It subsequently classifies historical sources into three categories: written, material (artefactual), and oral sources. Oral sources are exemplified primarily through oral traditions, such as '*macapat*' (oral advice) and folktales. The Grade X history textbook for the social sciences stream [36], similarly explains heuristics as the collection of historical data from different sources, including written and oral sources. These formulations represent a significant conceptual development compared with the 2013 Curriculum because oral evidence is no longer merely encountered in an isolated historical narrative; it becomes part of the textbook's explicit explanation of how historical knowledge is produced.

However, detailed explanations of the production of historical knowledge are still very limited, as they place more emphasis on procedural taxonomy than methodology. Students have indeed been taught that oral sources exist, but they receive very limited guidance on how oral testimony should be collected and critically evaluated. Thus, placing only 'oral sources' alongside written and material sources risks reducing oral history to another category of evidence rather than presenting it as a typical historical practice. At least the Grade X textbook makes mention of oral history; by contrast, the Grade XI textbook refers to it only once, as an assignment for students, without providing any guidance on how such an oral history task should be conducted.

Grade XII textbooks, fortunately, provide a more substantial example of the potential of oral history [34]. In discussing the transition from Sukarno's time to Suharto's time, this textbook directs students to read a book entitled '*Pengumpulan Sumber Sejarah Lisan: Gerakan Mahasiswa 1966 dan 1998*.' The publication was produced from interviews with historical actors involved in the two student movements and was intended to document experiences that were not fully available through written documents. The textbook therefore does more than simply mention oral sources; it introduces students to an actual corpus of oral historical material that

can be used to investigate a contested and politically significant period of Indonesian history. This represents a potentially important pedagogical shift because students can encounter history through the testimonies of historical actors rather than exclusively through retrospective textbook narratives.

However, this approach still positions oral history primarily as a secondary reference for studying the past, rather than as a method by which students themselves investigate the past. The textbook recommends existing publications as sources, but according to the material analyzed, it does not require students to conduct their own interviews with historical actors or critically analyze the production of testimony. This distinction matters. Reading a collection of oral history is different from writing an oral history. The former exposes students to testimony; the latter requires them to participate in the process of investigation, interview, source criticism, interpretation, and historical representation. Research in history education suggests that engagement with oral history can contribute to historical competence, and experimental evidence suggests that students who conduct oral history interviews perform better on some measure of historical competence than students in control conditions [8], [10], [11], [12], [43], [44], [45], [46], [47].

3.3 Oral History Shifting Position

Taken together, the findings indicate a three-level shift in the position of oral history between the two curricula: from implicit curricular possibility, to explicit recognition of oral sources, and potentially toward inquiry-based engagement with oral history. Under the 2013 Curriculum [39], oral history was largely invisible at the curricular level and appeared only sporadically in textbooks, with the Grade X example itself representing oral tradition more than oral history [30]. Under the *Kurikulum Merdeka* [42], oral sources are explicitly incorporated into the explanation of historical research and source classification, while a documented oral history collection is introduced as a learning resource in Grade XII [34]. The shift can therefore be interpreted as an increase in the visibility and legitimacy of oral evidence within school history education. Yet the shift remains incomplete because explicit recognition of oral sources has not consistently been translated into explicit instruction in oral history methodology.

This finding challenges a simple interpretation that the *Kurikulum Merdeka* has “included oral history” whereas the 2013 Curriculum did not. The more accurate conclusion is that the two curricula differ in the degree and form of institutional recognition given to oral sources. The 2013 Curriculum established competencies compatible with historical inquiry but provided little curricular or textbook support for oral history. The *Kurikulum Merdeka* makes the source base of historical inquiry more visible, but the textbooks still tend to present oral sources as information to be collected or consumed rather than as evidence requiring a specialised process of production and interpretation. This distinction is important because historical thinking does not automatically arise only from students' exposure to various sources [27]. Students should be given the opportunity to collect data on their own [48], [49], [50], [51], then analyze the origin of the source (sourcing); the context and purpose of the source (contextualizing); and compare those sources (corroborating). In the context of oral testimony, these methodological questions should also include the relationship

between the limitations of memory and the degree of historical experience, including the context of the interaction between the interviewer and the narrator.

These findings indicate that the *Kurikulum Merdeka* has opened up a more favorable space for oral history when compared to the 2013 Curriculum. However, the recognition of oral history in the curriculum has not automatically made it integrated into the curriculum. The former, recognition, refers only to the mention that an oral source can be valid historical evidence. The latter, integration, the curriculum to explicitly require students to systematically learn what oral history is and how to conduct historical research using oral sources. This shift offers an important direction for the future development of Indonesian history education. Instead of adding occasional references to oral sources in textbooks, oral history can be integrated into the very architecture of historical inquiry. Such integration will be consistent with the *Kurikulum Merdeka*'s emphasis on inquiry while expanding students' understanding of what constitutes historical evidence and whose experiences can contribute to historical knowledge. In this case, the shift in the position of oral history from the 2013 Curriculum to the *Kurikulum Merdeka* is a movement from marginality to visibility, though not yet towards full methodological integration. The challenge in the future, more fundamentally, students need to be positioned as critical producers and not just passive users of historical knowledge.

4 Conclusion

This study shows that there is a shift in the position of oral history in Indonesian history education from the 2013 Curriculum to the *Kurikulum Medeka*. In the 2013 Curriculum, oral history has not been explicitly placed as a type of historical source or method of historical research, although some competencies that require students to conduct research actually open up opportunities to use them. This still limited position is also reflected in textbooks, where oral sources only appear briefly in class X and are not found in historical discussions in classes XI and XII. Meanwhile, the *Kurikulum Merdeka* provides a clearer space for oral sources by including them in the discussion of historical sources and historical research stages, especially in class X. However, the change only shows a shift from a marginal position to a more visible position, not yet to the integration of oral history as a research method that is systematically practiced by students.

Based on these findings, oral history needs to be integrated more systematically in history education in Indonesia, both through the curriculum and textbooks. This integration is not enough just to mention oral history as one type of historical source, but it needs to be accompanied by learning about how oral history is carried out, starting from determining informants, conducting interviews, evaluating testimonies, comparing them with other sources, to presenting the results in the form of historical narratives. The curriculum needs to provide more explicit direction regarding the purposes and procedures for the use of oral history, while textbooks need to provide examples as well as activities that allow students to engage directly in oral history research. Thus, students not only become users of historical information, but can also play the role of novice researchers who critically explore the experiences and memories of the people in their environment. This integration can ultimately

expand the resources of history learning while encouraging more critical, inclusive, and development-oriented historical learning skills.

Acknowledgments. We would like to express sincere thanks to the Universitas Negeri Malang Research Fund, which granted the study under Project Number 13.4.278/UN32/KP/2026.

Disclosure of Interests. The author declares that he has no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

References

1. Gottschalk, L.: *Understanding History: A Primer of Historical Method*, 2nd edn. Alfred A. Knopf, New York (1969)
2. Kuntowijoyo: *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah*. Bentang, Yogyakarta (1999)
3. Carr, E.H.: *What is History?* Palgrave, Basingstoke (2001)
4. Couttenier, M.: "No documents, no history". *Museum History Journal* 3(2), 132–148 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1179/mhj.2010.3.2.123>
5. McCullagh, D.: "No documents, no history". RTE (2017), <https://www.rte.ie/news/analysis-and-comment/2017/0119/846262-no-documents-no-history/>
6. Voss-Hubbard, A.: "No document-No history": Mary Ritter Beard and the early history of women's archives. *The American Archivist* 58(1), 16–30 (1995)
7. Kartodirdjo, S.: Metode penggunaan bahan dokumen. *Jurnal Sejarah Indonesia* 3(1), 1–8 (2011)
8. Llewellyn, K.R., Cook, S.A.: *Oral History as Peace Pedagogy*. In: *Oral History and Education*, pp. 17–41. Palgrave Macmillan, New York (2017). https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95019-5_2
9. Thompson, P., Bornat, J.: *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, 4th edn. Oxford University Press, New York (2017)
10. Sotelo-Castro, L.C., Shapiro-Phim, T.: Listening as common ground: oral history performance for transitional justice. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 28(1), 1–18 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2023.2184250>
11. Gardner, P.: Oral history in education: teacher's memory and teachers' history. *History of Education* 32(2), 175–188 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1080/004676003004159>
12. Llewellyn, K.R., Ng-A-Fook, N.: Introduction: Oral History Education for Twenty-First-Century Schooling. In: *Oral History and Education*, pp. 1–14. Palgrave Macmillan, New York (2017). https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95019-5_1
13. Abrams, L.: *Oral History Theory*, 2nd edn. Routledge, London (2016)
14. Kuntowijoyo: *Metodologi Sejarah*. Tiara Wacana, Yogyakarta (2003)
15. Sayono, J.: Pembelajaran sejarah di sekolah: Dari pragmatis ke idealis. *Jurnal Sejarah dan Budaya* 7(1), 9–17 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.17977/sb.v7i1.4733>
16. Hasan, S.H.: Kurikulum sejarah dan pendidikan sejarah lokal. In: Mulyana, A., Gunawan, R. (eds.) *Sejarah Lokal: Penulisan dan Pembelajaran di Sekolah*, pp. 179–193. Salamina Press, Bandung (2007)
17. Ministry of Education and Culture: Empat perbaikan Kurikulum 2013. *Jendela Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* 1(3), 6–7 (2016)
18. Slameto: Rasional dan elemen perubahan Kurikulum 2013. *Scholaria: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* 5(1), 1–9 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.24246/j.scholaria.2015.v5.i1.p1-9>
19. Agustinova, D.E.: Penerapan Kurikulum 2013 pada mata pelajaran sejarah pada Sekolah Menengah Atas. *Istoria: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sejarah* 14(1), 1–9 (2018)

20. Burhanudin, M., Sodik, I.: Kendala guru sejarah dalam Kurikulum 2013 menggunakan pendekatan saintifik di SMK Negeri 7 Semarang. *Indonesian Journal of History Education* 6(1), 89–102 (2018)
21. Widiadi, A.N., Handoyo, I.C., Saputra, M.R.A.: Merdeka berpikir sejarah: Alternatif strategi implementasi keterampilan berpikir sejarah dalam penerapan Kurikulum Merdeka. *Sejarah dan Budaya: Jurnal Sejarah, Budaya, dan Pengajarannya* 16(1), 235–247 (2022)
22. Purwanto, B.: *Gagalnya historiografi Indonesiasentris?!*. Penerbit Ombak, Yogyakarta (2006)
23. Nordholt, H.S., Purwanto, B., Saptari, R.: Memikir Ulang Historiografi Indonesia. In: Nordholt, H.S., Purwanto, B., Saptari, R. (eds.) *Perspektif Baru Penulisan Sejarah Indonesia*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia-KITLV, Jakarta (2008)
24. Nichterlein, S.: Historicism and historiography in Indonesia. *History and Theory* 13(3), 253–272 (1974). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2504778>
25. Hasan, S.H.: Pendidikan sejarah untuk kehidupan abad ke 21. *Historia: Jurnal Pendidik dan Peneliti Sejarah* 2(2), 61–72 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.17509/historia.v2i2.16630>
26. Hasan, S.H.: History education in Curriculum 2013: A new approach to teaching history. *Historia: International Journal of History Education* 14(1), 163–178 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.17509/historia.v14i1.2023>
27. Widiadi, A.N.: Analysing documents and interpreting textbooks: Students’ historical thinking skills in learning about the battle of Surabaya. Ph.D. thesis, Victoria University of Wellington (2021)
28. Bowen, G.A.: Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal* 9(2), 27–40 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
29. Abdurakhman, Pradono, A., Sunarti, L., Zuhdi, S.: *Sejarah Indonesia: Untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XII*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta (2015)
30. Gunawan, R., Lestariningsih, A.D., Sardiman: *Sejarah Indonesia: Untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas X*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta (2017)
31. Sardiman, Lestariningsih, A.D.: *Sejarah Indonesia: Untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XI Semester 1*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta (2017)
32. Sardiman, Lestariningsih, A.D.: *Sejarah Indonesia: Untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XI Semester 2*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta (2017)
33. Safitry, M., Utami, I.W.P., Ilyas, Z.: *Sejarah untuk SMA/SMK Kelas XI*. Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, Jakarta (2021)
34. Safitry, M., Utami, I.W.P., Ratmanto, A.: *Sejarah untuk SMA/MA Kelas XII*. Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, Jakarta (2022)
35. Oktafiana, S.: *Sejarah untuk SMK Kelas X*. Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan Kemendikbudristek, Jakarta (2021)
36. Oktafiana, S., Jaya, E.F., Satria, M.R.: *Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial untuk SMA/MA Kelas X*. Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan Kemendikbudristek, Jakarta (2023)
37. Krippendorff, K.: *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, 4th edn. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071878781>
38. Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Saldana, J.: *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*, 3rd edn. SAGE Publications, Los Angeles (2014)
39. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan: *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 37 Tahun 2018 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 24 Tahun 2016 tentang Kompetensi Inti dan Kompetensi Dasar Pada Kurikulum 2013 Pada Pendidikan Dasar dan Pendidikan Menengah*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta (2018)
40. Vansina, J.: *Tradisi Lisan sebagai Sejarah*. Penerbit Ombak, Yogyakarta (2014)
41. Lee, P., Shemilt, D.: A scaffold, not a cage: progression and progression models in history. *Teaching History* 113, 13–23 (2003)

42. Kemendikbudristek: Keputusan Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kemendikbudristek No 008/H/KR/2022. Kemendikbudristek, Jakarta (2022)
43. Lee, C.R., Nasstrom, K.L.: Practice and Pedagogy: Oral History in the Classroom. *The Oral History Review* 25(1–2), 1–7 (1998)
44. Bertram, C., Wagner, W., Trautwein, U.: Learning Historical Thinking With Oral History Interviews: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Intervention Study of Oral History Interviews in History Lessons. *American Educational Research Journal* 54(3), 444–484 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217694833>
45. Ebner, M.H.: Students as Oral Historians. *The History Teacher* 9(2), 196–201 (1976). <https://doi.org/10.2307/492286>
46. Whitman, G.: Teaching Students How to Be Historians: An Oral History Project for the Secondary School Classroom. *The History Teacher* 33(4), 469–481 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.2307/494943>
47. Gibson, L., Roberts-Smith, J., Llewellyn, K.R., Llewellyn, J.: A New Approach to Virtual Reality in History Education: The Digital Oral Histories for Reconciliation Project (DOHR). In: *History Education in the Digital Age*, pp. 103–121. Springer, Cham (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10743-6_6
48. Wineburg, S., Martin, D., Monte-Sano, C.: *Reading Like a Historian: Teaching Literacy in Middle and High School History Classrooms*. Teachers College Press, New York (2011)
49. Wineburg, S.: Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 83(1), 73–87 (1991). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73>
50. Wineburg, S.: On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal* 28(3), 495–519 (1991). <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312028003495>
51. Wineburg, S.: *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia (2001)

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

