

LITERATURE AND ITS LEARNING IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

Fatmah AR. Umar*

Department of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Letters and Culture,
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia
fatmah.umar@ung.ac.id

Received: 5-04-2021

Accepted: 18-05-2021

Published: 29-05-2021

Abstract: The present work aimed at exploring (1) the condition of Indonesian literature and its learning in the curriculum development perspective, (2) the past and the current learning orientation, (2) Indonesian literature learning in multiculturalism perspectives, and (3) efforts to accentuate a liberating, literary education and learning concept. In this qualitative descriptive research, all data were collected from documentation, observation, and interview. The results showed that: First, in the old order (*Orde Lama*), literature education was a separate subject before being integrated into the Indonesian language subject since the New Order (*Orde Baru*). Theoretical knowledge has long been emphasized in literature learning. To this day, literature education has focused on the creation and preservation of the culture of silence. Educators (teachers) have been plagued by being powerless and unable to express themselves. As a result, the teachers opt to remain silent, but they are trapped in a situation of being alienated from reality. Second, Indonesian literature learning, from the perspective of structuralism, indicates plurality embedded in the core of the Indonesian literary works that covers the aspects of culture, language, themes, and pronunciation. Third, efforts to accentuate a liberating, literary education and learning concept can be made through (i) writing, reading, and interpreting the literary works, the involvement of litterateurs in extracurricular activities (teaching and learning of literature), and (iii) taking advantages potential texts containing the socio-cultural concept of literature, and (iv) referring to the original principle of literature education.

Keywords: curriculum; learning; literature

INTRODUCTION

Tyler (as cited in Nurdin & Adrianoni, 2016) opines that four questions underpin curriculum development: what are the learning objectives and the competencies that students need to master, (2) what kinds of learning experience that the teacher should create, (3) what are the teaching and learning materials, and (4) what are the indicators of successful learning. All of these questions apply to the development of the literary education curriculum.

Literary works are the representation of factual and imaginative truth. Simply put, literature is written based on facts. Such facts are dressed with the author's imagination. Abidin (2016) mentions four major components that form a literary work: author as the writer, language as the medium, literary work as the content, and elements of literary work as the structure. As one of the components, the aspect of language has its distinct characteristics. In

this context, the language in a literary work refers to the expression of authors' ideas, which sometimes deviate from the conventions of grammar; this concept is known as *licencia poetica*. Ratna (2007) opine that "the beauty of a literary work lies in the beauty of its language." (p.154). These four components highlight the importance of literary education.

In the competence-based curriculum for the Indonesian language subject for junior high schools and Islamic school equivalent developed by the Department of National Education (2004), Indonesian literature is regarded as a cultural product with intellectual rights. Literary works as a cultural product are, without question, an embodiment of one's feeling, creation, and creative, innovative, and appreciative intention expressed through a language as the medium. Further, a literary work should

*Corresponding Author:
fatmah.umar@ung.ac.id



be beneficial for society. Such a quality is generally seen in moral education (Ratna, 2007). Within literary works are incorporated many cultural values (moral, ethic, and aesthetic values) that one must explore, understand, scrutinize, and implement in his or her life. This principle is in line with the micro function and goal of national education, i.e., “Producing human beings who believe in and devote to God Almighty, who are civilized and have a cultural perspective of the Indonesian nation, who are reasoned (advanced, competent, intelligent, creative, innovative, and responsible), capable of communicating socially (orderly and aware of the law, cooperative and competitive, democratic), and healthy for they become independent humans” (Mulyasa, 2013, p.20). Messages in a literary work and the functions and the foals of national education are implemented operationally in the teaching and learning process as based on the curriculum.

Ratna (2007) asserts that the primary function of literary work is “revealing issues about truth.” (p.161). The truth encompasses factual and imaginative truth. The factual truth is the justification of truth, and the imaginative truth is regarded as the justification of feeling. Among the examples of factual truth can be seen in Ramayana or Malin Kundang story. The two folks are claimed by many as a true story. As a result, people have built a monument (statue or grave) representing the character of the stories. The truth of artwork or literary work is, by nature, problematic. It is not about the obtained truth; it is about discovering the truth. Imagination is the aspect that bridges social facts that embed to the subject understanding framework of both the author or readers and thus resulting in different interpretations.

Literary education requires creative teaching since literary works are creative products by nature. By that, the learning activities should allow one to explore the aspects of appreciation, creation, and expression. Teachers are, thereby, urged to be more creative and innovative. All learning activities should not revolve around reading many textbooks. The class should incorporate various activities, such as workshops, literary

camp, recreation (with the integration of literary learning) to equip students with skills necessary for learning literature.

Implementing the ideal literary education as mentioned above seems to be a long way to go. Since the 1950s, theoretical learning (such as memorizing the theories of literary works, i.e., plot, setting, point of view, renowned litterateurs and their works) has long been emphasized in literary education in all educational levels, ranging from elementary, junior high, and senior high level. Even in the university, literary education incorporates little to less variation in its learning activities. This is based on the preliminary observation during the ASD program and in supervising the pre-service teachers. The learning activities are mostly the identification of the intrinsic and extrinsic elements and the language aspects of literary works from reading textbooks. Changes in such a system is not possible unless there is a breakthrough in literary education. Improvement in literary education should also take into consideration the assessment aspects. The assessment and evaluation should go beyond examining students’ memorizing skills (giving tests about the theory of literature); the tests should examine the practical skills (Mahayana, 2007; Sayuti, Jamaludin, Rusyana, & Oemarjati, as cited in Abidin, 2012).

According to the history of curriculum development, there have been changes in several aspects of literary education, such as the position of the subject, the learning duration, the learning system, objectives, and assessment methods. During the Dutch and Japan colonialism era (1908-1945), literature served as the medium of expressing freedom, a weapon that people could use to reclaim their independence. For this reason, literary education received special treatment from the government in the Old Order (1950-1964). Literary education became a separate subject listed in category A, while the Indonesian language was in category C along with other subjects, i.e., the

Geography of Indonesia, the History of Indonesia, and Citizenship Education. In 1962, subjects, such as the Indonesian language, the geography of Indonesia, and civic education were prioritized in terms of contact hours, assessment, and evaluation. The policy of listing the Indonesian language as the priority subject remained the same from the New Order era (1965-1968) to these days (due to the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum that had been revised several times based on the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Ministry of Education and Higher Education of 2013, 2014, 2016, 2018, 2019, and 2020. This is seen from the curriculum structure and the duration of contact hours each week in every education level. Since the New Order, literature has been an integrated subject. The subject is now incorporated in the Indonesian language subject as stipulated in the 2013 Curriculum and its 2014, 2016, 2018, 2019, and 2020 revision. Nevertheless, literary education is still treated equally as the Indonesian language subject. This is based on the basic competencies for the elementary, junior high, and senior high level (the Regulation of Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 34 of 2018, the Regulation of the Ministry of Education Number Number 37 of 2018, the Decree of the Language and Book Development Agency Number 018 of 2020.

The present work was aimed at exploring: (1) the condition of Indonesian literature and its learning in the curriculum development perspective; (2) the past and the current learning orientation; (3) Indonesian literature learning in multiculturalism perspectives, and; (4) efforts to accentuate a liberating, literary education and learning concept. From the above discussion, one can say that literature and its teachings and education are equally important as other disciplines in improving the quality of students in terms of religious aspects and technology and sciences. This notion underpins the necessity to promote the teaching and learning of literature as a separate subject by retaining its principles and orientations, similar to other fields of study.

METHOD

In this qualitative descriptive research, all data were collected from documentation, participant observation, and open interview (Mulyana, 2003; Sugiyono, 2009). The documentation method was applied to retrieve theoretical data related to curriculum development, including literary education and its complexity. The lesson plan was the one used by the supervisor teacher and pre-service teachers of Kabila Senior High School, Bone Bolango Regency in 2019 and MAN Islamic Senior High School Model in Gorontalo in 2020. Data regarding teaching and learning activities were retrieved from observation. The observation aimed to determine whether or not the teaching-learning activities matched the components in the lesson plan. The components involved the core competencies and basic competencies, objectives, materials, models, media, and assessment. An interview was conducted in the two schools previously mentioned to obtain more data about the classroom activities and the lesson plan. The data were from the curriculum, textbooks, pre-service teachers, and the supervisor teachers.

All data were analyzed by (1) reading all documents related to curriculum and its development, (2) taking notes about information on preventing the marginalization of literature education and efforts to promote a liberating, literary education and teaching, (3) providing codes and tabulating collected data from step 2, (4) classifying, (5) scrutinizing, (6) compiling, and (7) reporting data. This research also has obtained consent from all of the subjects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Provided in the sections below are (1) the condition of Indonesian literature and its learning in the curriculum development perspective, (2) the past and the current learning orientation, (3) Indonesian literature learning in multiculturalism perspectives, and (4) efforts to accentuate a liberating, literary education and learning concept.

Conditions of Indonesian literature and its education and teaching in the curriculum

Based on the documentation, observation, and interview, it is revealed that literature has long been taught in Indonesia from the colonialism era to these days. Nevertheless, exploring the development of literary education from several components is essential. Those components are discussed below.

Literary education in the perspective of learning

During the Dutch and Japanese colonialism (1908-1945), the teaching of literature has received attention in addition to natural sciences and socio-economic subjects. At the time, many Indonesian litterateurs took the opportunity to fight for their independence using literary works written in Malay language in their anti-imperialism campaign. Indonesian language, which originated from the Malay language, was soon being taught in MULO or the advanced primary education in the Dutch Era. From 1935 to 1945, the Indonesian subject was developed for third graders, specifically native Indonesians or *bumiputera*. Further, the Indonesian language was used as the medium of instruction, replacing the Dutch language in the Japanese colonialism period (Idi, 2007; Nawai as cited in Nurdin & Adrianoni, 2016).

The curriculum in post-colonialism (Regional Autonomy) was known as the 1947 curriculum.

Components of the Indonesian language subject, i.e., the position and the objective, were not explicitly stated. Despite this, the research ensured that the subject was taught at school. This is based on the common perspective in the Dutch and Japanese colonialism era (where the Indonesian language subject became one of the taught subjects, which also hold strategic positions) and the post-independence perspective, and the influence of the colonies on the education system (Widyastono, 2014).

Literary education was initially listed in group A subjects. In 1962, subjects, such as the Indonesian language, the geography of Indonesia, and civic education were prioritized

in terms of its contact hours, assessment, and evaluation. Throughout its development, literary education was in the category of emotional/artistic subject along with music education, painting, dance, and drama from 1952 to 1964. The Indonesian language, on the other hand, fell under the category of intelligent development; other subjects covered in this category are the local language, numeracy skill, and natural sciences. On the one hand,

During the New Order (1965 to 1968), the Indonesian language subject became one of the priority subject other than Geography and Civics Education. This situation mirrors the condition in the Old Order. In 1968, the Indonesian language subject was in the group of Pancasila development along with other subjects, e.g., Religion, Civics Education, Local Language, and Sports Education (Idi, 2007). Although the Indonesian language was prioritized, literary education was treated equally; it was no longer a separate subject—it was integrated in the Indonesian language.

In 1973 (the implementation of Perintis project), Indonesian language and literature education was still treated exclusively. This is seen from several events related to the subject that is still held, i.e., poetry out loud.

Another change in the curriculum system took place in 1975 with the newly developed 1975 Curriculum. So far, Indonesia has implemented several curriculum systems, ranging from the 1984 Curriculum (CBSA), the 1994 Curriculum, the 1999 Curriculum (the enhanced curriculum), the Competence-based Curriculum in 2004, the School-based Curriculum in 2006, and the 2013 Curriculum (holistic). This year, the Indonesian language and literature subject has been integrated and considered a priority subject. This is based on the 2013 Curriculum, which identifies the subject as “Indonesian Language” rather than the “Indonesian Language and Literature.” As a result, literary education is integrated into

the Indonesian language subject. The syllabus is also considered the two subjects as one entity. This notion is also underpinned by the formulation of the basic competencies. Based on the total contact hours per week, the Indonesian language subject is still a priority subject in all educational levels, ranging from elementary, junior high, and senior high.

According to the documentation results, the contact hour of the subject in the elementary school, from fourth to sixth grades, is 5 hours. As stated in the Regulation of Ministry of Education and Culture Number 35 of 2018 concerning the curriculum structure of the Indonesian language for junior high schools, the contact hour is six hours per week. While in the senior high school, the contact hour is 4 hours; this is stipulated in the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture Number 36 of 2018 concerning the curriculum structure of the Indonesian language for senior high schools.

The allocation is three hours for tenth grade and four hours for eleventh and twelfth grade. Observation results report that the duration of the Indonesian language subject is higher than other subjects, except the natural sciences and mathematics in junior high school (the total contact hour of the two subjects is equal to the Indonesian language subject). Despite this, there is a concerning difference in terms of the total lesson between literature and language-related topics.

This is displayed in the formulation of the basic competencies stipulated in the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture Number 37 of 2018 concerning the core and basic competencies in the 2013 Curriculum for the Indonesian language and literature subject at elementary and secondary schools.

Table 1. *The formulation of the basic competencies stipulated in the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture Number 37 of 2018 concerning the core and basic competencies in the 2013 Curriculum for the Indonesian language and literature subject at elementary and secondary schools*

No.	Level Elementary/Islamic school equivalence	Class	Total of basic competencies	Total of literary education basic competencies	Number Basic Competencies	of	Difference
		I	11	1	3.11	4.11	10
		II	10	2	3.5	4.5	8
					3.8	4.8	
		III	10	1	3.8	4.8	9
		IV	10	4	3.5	4.5	6
					3.6	4.6	
					3.9	4.9	
					3.10	4.10	
		V	9	1	3.6	4.6	8
		VI	10	2	3.5	4.5	8
					3.10	4.10	
	Elementary/Islamic school equivalence	I	6	0			6
		II	6	3	3.3	4.3	3
					3.4	4.4	
					3.5	4.5	
	(Based on the Decree of the Language and Book Development Agency Number	III	5	1	3.3	4.3	4
		IV	5	2	3.3	4.3	3
					3.5	4.5	

018/H/KR/2020)	V	5	1	3.4	4.4	4
	VI	6	2	3.4	4.4	4
Junior high/Islamic school equivalence	VII	16	6	3.9	4.9	10
				3.10	4.10	
				3.13	3.13	
				3.14	3.14	
				3.15	3.15	
				3.16	3.16	
	VIII	18	8	3.7	4.7	8
				3.8	3.8	
				3.11	4.11	
				3.12	4.12	
				3.15	4.15	
				3.16	4.16	
				3.17	3.17	
				3.18	4.18	
	IX	16	6	3.5	4.5	10
				3.6	4.6	
				3.13	4.13	
				3.14	4.14	
				3.15	3.15	
				3.16	3.16	
Senior high/Islamic equivalence	X	18	8	3.7	4.7	10
				3.8	4.8	
				3.9	4.9	
				3.14	4.14	
				3.15	4.15	
				3.16	4.16	
				3.17	4.17	
				3.18	3.18	
	XI	20	6	3.8	4.8	14
				3.9	4.9	
				3.11	4.11	
				3.18	4.18	
				3.19	4.19	
				3.20	4.20	
	XII	14	8	3.3	4.3	6
				3.4	4.4	
				3.7	4.7	
				3.8	4.8	
				3.9	4.9	
				3.12	4.12	
				3.13	4.13	
				3.14	4.14	
Vocational school/Islamic equivalence	X	18	8	3.7	4.7	10
				3.8	4.8	
				3.9	4.9	
				3.14	4.14	
				3.15	4.15	
				3.16	4.16	
				3.17	4.17	

XI	20	6	3.18	3.18	14
			3.8	4.8	
			3.9	4.9	
			3.11	4.11	
			3.18	4.18	
			3.19	4.19	
XII	14	8	3.20	4.20	6
			3.3	4.3	
			3.4	4.4	
			3.7	4.7	
			3.8	4.8	
			3.9	4.9	
			3.12	4.12	
			3.13	4.13	
			3.14	4.14	

The above table indicates that literature is still a sub-part of the Indonesian language subject. Further, the data confirm that literature seems to be marginalized due to the difference in total competencies, ranging from 3 to 14. What the authorities should do is developing a learning and evaluation system that fits the Indonesian language subject learning objectives (Mahsun, 2014).

Literary education from the perspective of learning goals and systems

The goal of education in the Dutch colonial period (1900) was to prepare the Dutch people born in Indonesia to be mid to higher class of employees (or *kline*). At the time of the Japanese empire occupation (in 1942), the goal of education was shifted: the education activity was lacking in terms of the principle of learning; it rather aimed at supporting the colony while they were in Indonesia (Idi, 2007).

The curriculum in post-colonialism (Regional Autonomy) was known as the 1947 curriculum.

This curriculum was the first curriculum applied since the independence of Indonesia. At that time, the education system was influenced by the Dutch and Japanese systems. Nevertheless, Pancasila values had been used as the core educational principle. The learning plans were designed to produce students “who are independent, sovereign, and equal to people

from other countries” (Widyastono, 2014, p.55).

During the Old Order (1950-1964), there were several education systems in a specific period. From 1950 to 1955, the objective of learning in senior high level was based on Law Number 4 of 1950, which later amended to Law Number 12 of 1954, chapter II, article 3) is based on the teaching of principles stated in Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, and the values of Indonesian culture. Curriculum applied from 1952 to 1964 was known as the separated subject curriculum (Idi, 2007). This curriculum was later replaced by the correlated curriculum in 1964.

Idi (2007) also noted a curriculum specifically designed for elementary school, which was applied from 1952 to 1964. This curriculum was aimed at producing democratic humans with good morals who contributed to the welfare of society and the nation. The curriculum in 1964 intended to instill the value of Pancasila and Manipol Usdek (the principles of Pancasila, and manifestation of politics, the 1945 Constitution, Guided Democracy, Guided Economy, and Indonesian Personality) to ensure a just, wealthy community (in terms of material and spiritual wealth).

The education system in the 1952-1964 period was called the "Panca Wardana"

system or a system of five aspects of development, namely (1) moral development. Those five aspects involve social education, religious and character education; (2) intelligence development, including Indonesian and regional languages, arithmetic, and natural knowledge; (3) emotional or artistic development, including literary arts, music, painting, visual arts, dance, and drama; (4) development of pragmatism, including agriculture and animal husbandry, small industries and handcraft industries, cooperatives, and; (5) physical development, including physical education and health education (Widyastono, 2014; Idi, 2007).

The objective of the curriculum in the New Order era (1965 to 1968) was to produce human beings who uphold the value of Pancasila as stated in the opening of the 1945 Constitution and the content of the 1945 Constitution (the Decree of Temporary Peoples' Consultative Assembly or MPRS Number XXVII/Chapter II, Article 3). From 1965 to 1968, the goal of the national education at the elementary level was to produce human beings who uphold the value of Pancasila as stated in the opening of the 1945 Constitution and the content of the 1945 Constitution. Self-reliance was the core value embedded in every taught subject. The curriculum contained three subjects, namely Pancasila education, basic science education, and specific skill education. At the junior high school level, the curriculum was devoted to preparing students to be good citizens. Subjects, such as Indonesian language, geography, and civic education became the focus of the curriculum. In SPG (or teacher school) curriculum, the aim was to produce human resources who uphold the value of Pancasila as stated in the 1945 Constitution. The curriculum focused on developing specific skills for teachers through subjects, such as Teaching Sciences, Expression Education Practice, Language Skills, Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and social sciences.

According to Idi (2007) and Widyastono (2007), the learning orientation in the 1968 curriculum was divided into three groups, namely (1) the Pancasila development,

including Religious Education, Citizenship Education, Indonesian Language Education, Regional Languages, and Sports; (2) basic knowledge development, including numeracy, natural sciences, health education, and family welfare education (including health sciences), and; (3) special skill groups, including agrarian vocational (agriculture, animal husbandry, fisheries), vocational engineering, vocational management and services (cooperatives).

In 1973, a curriculum called the 1973 Curriculum or School Development Pilot Project was designed. The 1973 Curriculum was intended to improve the quality of education. On that ground, a system called a module system (complete and sustainable learning) was applied (Soediarso as cited in Widyastono, 2014).

Another change in the curriculum system took place in 1975 with the newly developed 1975 curriculum. This curriculum highlights the efficiency and effectiveness of learning, which is influenced by the concepts of management. All teachers are required to develop PPSI or Instructional System Development Procedure. During that period, the objective of the national education was "Increasing devotion to God Almighty, enhancing intelligence, skills, character, building positive personality, and strengthening the spirit of nationalism in order to foster human resources for self-development and nation's development." The orientation of the lessons focuses on balancing the cognitive aspects, skills, attitudes, theoretical knowledge, and practices that support the teaching and learning activities.

The curriculum system was changed in 1984 with the newly developed 1984 curriculum. This curriculum seemed to be an improvement for teaching methods and student learning. The rationale of the curriculum is to produce active learners. In this context, the students are the ones who are responsible for gaining knowledge and experience from relevant resources (CBSA or active learner's approach).

The 1994 Curriculum for the elementary school was aimed at equipping the students with basic skills to be a part of society, the citizen of the nation, and to continue their study in the secondary school (Regulation of the Government Number 28 of 1990). There are 14 subjects, including the Indonesian language, in the curriculum. Further, the curriculum put more emphasis on science and technology education to prepare students for the future of the industrialization era of the 21st century (Idi, 2007). For the senior high level, the curriculum prepares the students for continuing their study at the higher education institutions and for self-development that corresponds to the development of science, technology, and arts. The 1994 Curriculum was flexible in nature as the local content subject was of particular attention. Another information worth mentioning is the development of the 1994 Curriculum as depicted from the 9-year compulsory education policy and local content subjects. This is based on Law Number 2 of 1989 Concerning the National Education System, which denoted the changes in the education system (from the quarter to the semester system). In this period, all the subjects focused on the understanding of concepts and problem-solving skills (Depdikbud as cited in Widyastono, 2014).

The curriculum system was changed in 1999 with the newly developed 1999 curriculum (the revamped 1994 curriculum). The competency-based curriculum was specifically designed for vocational schools. Focuses of learning activities were not only for the enhancement of cognitive knowledge but also the development of psychomotor and affective aspects.

Revision in the curriculum system Post-regional Autonomy era took place in 2004, with the establishment of the Competency-based Curriculum (KBK) or the 2004 Curriculum. The 2004 Curriculum was based on Law Number 22 of 1999 Concerning the Regional Autonomy and Government Regulation Number 25 of 2000 Concerning the Government Autonomy and Provincial Autonomy as an Autonomous Region. Several changes had been made in the

curriculum, such as the shift from the material-based curriculum to the competence-based curriculum. The 2004 Curriculum provides the schools and its Islamic school equivalent the opportunity to manage and allow the parents to get involved in the learning process starting from kindergarten to the university level.

In 2006, a curriculum called the 1973 Curriculum or School Development Pilot Project was designed. The development of the School-based Curriculum in 2006 was based on Law Number 20 of 2003 Concerning the National Education System, which was later amended to Government Regulation Number 19 of 2003 Concerning the Education Standard (the Government Regulation Number 19 of 2005 Considering the National Education Standards). In the regulation, it is stated that the national curriculum is no longer applied; the curriculum is later changed to the School-based Curriculum that is conducted in each school (Depdiknas, 2005).

The curriculum system was changed in 2013 with the 2013 Curriculum. Focuses of this curriculum are the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. The 2013 Curriculum is basically an enhancement of the contents, goals, and systems of the previous curriculums with an emphasis on scientific approaches. The scientific approach in the 2013 Curriculum has actually been applied in the 1984 Curriculum (CBSA).

Literary education from the perspective of teaching and learning implementation

The result of documentation, participation observation, empirical experience, and open interview reveals several issues in Indonesia literary education from the perspective of learning implementation. There are several conceptions claiming that the faculty of letters is not a litterateur school. The faculty is intended to prepare students who are aspired to be experts in literature or critics. Studying Indonesian literature is not a

guarantee to get promising jobs. People are unfamiliar with the literature. Enrolling at the department of Indonesian literature is a ticket to poverty. All of those paradigms can be traced back to 1989, during which the researcher taught a subject called Literature Workshop was still among the subjects offered at universities. This subject focused on practical experiences rather than studying theories. At the time, a senior lecturer criticized the researcher. The lecturer plied the researcher with questions, pondering regarding the outcomes of teaching theories (mostly) in Literature Workshop, which only prepare the students to be expert readers rather than writers or litterateurs. This condition resonates with concepts seen in Saidi's book entitled "*Matinya Dunia Sastra* (The Death of Literature)."

All concerns mentioned above blame misconception of the principles and objectives of literary education. Aristoteles (as cited in Saidi, 2004) argues that such concerns represent the arrogance of classic and contemporary philosophers. They believe that literature embodies the moral values of life. Literary works are the path to the truth, similar to religion, philosophy, and science.

Past issues in literary education are still relevant these days. This is because of the inability of each curriculum in attaining the goals of literary education as stated in the results of the Fourth Indonesian Language Congress and the Fourth National Scientific Conference in Lembang, 1991 (Abidin, 2012). The two conferences reported that literary education was yet effective to be a medium for promoting cultural values.

Problems in literary education, in general, involve all learning elements, ranging from curriculum, textbooks and materials, teachers, teaching-learning methods, students, media, and assessment components (Sayuti, Jamaludin, Rusyana, & Endraswara, as cited in Abidin, 2012). The curriculum of literary education is primarily about teaching theories in a limited time. As a result, teachers opt to teach insignificant, less-difficult topics as long as the minimum contact hours are met. It is also revealed that not all students received textbooks

prepared by experts. This results in ineffective learning as the students should share the book with their friends sitting next to them. Teaching literature, which is a text-based subject, oftentimes ends up in monotonous activities. Both teachers and students are unable to enhance their imagination and creativity. They are so caught up with everything prepared by the authors in the textbooks. Such a condition results in students' low motivation in learning, given that the contents are irrelevant to their needs. To worsen, the structure of the textbooks is somewhat unorganized. This hinders students from developing their understanding. Moreover, the content of the books incorporates less moral development values.

Teachers become a subject of complaint due to their poor performance in teaching literature and their idea as the only source of knowledge. Such attitude, as based on Endraswara's opinion (as cited in Abidin, 2012) reflects the teachers' belief that they are superior to their students. The only task of the students is to follow everything their teachers assign. Consequently, the students are unable to improve their skills. The negative attitude of teachers is most likely due to lack of training and self-development programs.

Designing teaching-learning methods is teachers' responsibility. The significance of the methods is subject to teachers' performance. Inappropriate implementation of teaching-learning methods, learning media, and other supporting resources are detrimental to the teaching and learning of literature. The success of media utilization depends on teachers' performance.

Assessment of literature, in terms of its system, test types, and focus competencies, tends to emphasize the cognitive aspects rather than attitudes and skills. The test types are mostly multiple-choice. This is due to the guideline in schools.

Universities are also perplexed by the same problems that schools have to deal with. Endraswara (as cited in Abidin, 2012)

claims that the roots of the problems are old-school analysis and theory-oriented learning (the theories are mostly outdated). These conditions, as Endraswara opined 18 years ago in 2003, resulting in the low motivation of students to produce scientific papers. Similar problems still persist these days, although those are less concerning. Oemarjati (as cited in Abidin, 2012) agree with Endraswara's finding regarding the current issues in literary education at universities; this is based on (1) lecturers' tendency to assign tedious reading tasks to students, (2) small numbers of students' literary works (especially short stories) published in various media, and (3) below-average scores in literature subject. Compared to Oemarjati data (1991), the students' score range from 3 to 4 in 2020.

Indonesian literary education in multiculturalism perspective

In Indonesian literary education, multiculturalism issues have arisen since the emergence of modern Indonesian literary works. The rebirth of literary education demands teachers' cultural comprehension, which encompasses aspects, such as language, attire, behavior, attitudes, etc. This is to avoid misunderstanding of culture and its negative consequences. Mahayana (2005) opines that multiculturalism is underpinned by the belief that all cultural groups can be actualized and represented and coexist socially. On that ground, preventing racism is possible through developing a positive paradigm of diversity of ethnics and other culture-related concepts. There are three reasons underpinning the importance of understanding culture through literary works. First, modern Indonesian literature is a product of western culture assimilation within the written literature. Second, the Indonesian literary works were originated from litterateurs who closely associated with ethnic culture that shaped their paradigm. Third, the Indonesian literary works are written in the Indonesian language, i.e., a language originated from the Malay language group. The distribution of the language, which happened to be a lingua franca in Indonesia

since the Youth Pledge in Indonesia on October 28th, 1928.

All of the above three aspects shape the multicultural values of Indonesian literary works. This idea highlights the plurality embedded in some aspects of Indonesian literature, e.g., themes and pronunciation. On that ground, is it still appropriate to rely on textbooks solely in teaching literature? Are reading and working on tests the only strategies in teaching and learning literature? Is it relevant to equalize the evaluation instruments of literary education in all areas in Indonesia (from Sabang to Merauke)? If so, is such an act represent a form of discrimination against students' creativity and freedom of thought?

Solutions to some of the problems above are, according to the interview with an Indonesian language teacher, are providing teachers and students with textbooks. Teachers should also ask the students to find other learning resources, such as folklore and novels in their area (in this case, Gorontalo). These approaches are applicable based on the observation results at SMAN I senior high school in Bone Bolango, 2019. However, it was revealed that some of the additional resources are not feasible for tenth graders. In the end, the resources were replaced by other literary works. Another solution is to incorporate literary works containing different cultural aspects in Indonesia. This approach resonates with the notion of multicultural education by Banks (as cited in Suwawandi, 2019), who mentions the steps of multicultural education, e.g., integration of materials, knowledge construction, and adaptation of teaching-learning methods.

Towards a liberating, literary education, and learning

This study discusses the approaches to actualize a liberating literary education in the past, present, and future. Based on the documentation results, the element of a comprehensive and liberating literary education encompasses curriculum,

textbooks, teachers, teaching-learning methods, media, facilities and infrastructures, and assessment. In general, there are several approaches to attain better literary education.

Curriculum review

Curriculum development has long been started since the colonialism era to these days. This is based on the history of curriculum development. In the colonialism age, curriculum development focused on determining whether or not a subject should be taught. It depends on the interests of the colony rather than the indigenous society. There was a shift in the focus of curriculum development in 1973, 1984, 1994, 1999, 2004, and 2006. The goal was no longer about the materials; the emphasis was on the enhancement of teaching-learning activities. The 1973 Curriculum was known as *Proyek Perintis*. Improvement was made in the 1984 Curriculum with its CBSA (active learning) method. This system overly emphasizes students' activeness and independence. Flexibility was the distinctive feature of the 1994 Curriculum, which denoted the changes in the education system (from the quarter to the semester system). The 1999 Curriculum was known as the enhanced version of the previous curriculum. Some notable improvements involved the development of cognitive, psychomotor, and affective skills. The curriculum system was changed in 2004 (during the reformation era) with the 2004 Curriculum. This curriculum focused on competency-based content, signifying a shift from the material-based content. The 2006 Curriculum was known as the School-based Curriculum. This curriculum allows every school to make some adjustments depending on their needs. It gives teachers the freedom to manage every activity in the class. Parents are also provided with the opportunities to contribute to their children's learning activities regardless of the level of education (it encompass all education levels, i.e., elementary, junior high, senior high, and university level). The curriculum system was changed in 2013 with the 2013 Curriculum. This curriculum introduced the concept of spiritual, social,

cognitive, and affective development (holistic development). Revisions have also been made to the 2013 Curriculum. These can be seen in the Decree of the Ministry of Education and Culture of 2014, 2016 (Number 21, 22, 23, and 24), 2018 (34, 35, 36, and 37), and 2020 (Number 3), the Decree of the Ministry of Education and Culture Number 719/P/2020, and the Decree of the Language and Book Development Agency Number 018/H/2020.

The preparation and revision of textbooks should also be taken into consideration. Authorities are expected to provide the books to all students; they should identify the number of students before distributing the textbooks. The content of the books should give examples to students to be a part of a small community (family) and a country. All of those examples can also be implemented in students' daily activities and religious life.

Teachers are urged to be proactive in self-development activities. Programs that can help them to improve their performance range from individual to institutional programs, such as offline or online seminars, conferences, workshops, and other literary events. The teachers are also encouraged to broaden their insight by gaining more information from various mass media. It goes without saying that teachers are perplexed by complicated situations. Teachers often go awry. Despite such complexities, teachers should take an emancipatory standpoint. Such a standpoint represents constructive criticism that brings changes in education (Haberman, as cited in Wibowo, 2013). Teachers are agents of change; they need to change their status quo (or overly-devoted to one regime) (Foucault, as cited in Wibowo, 2013). Although policies regarding freedom in developing and implementing learning activities have been enacted since the 2006 Curriculum, some teachers still find it difficult to adapt to changes.

Educators, including lecturers, are urged to be more selective, creative, and

innovative in developing teaching-learning materials for literary education based on local wisdom. Local wisdom refers to knowledge containing values serving as the guide for a specific group of people (Sibarani, 2012). This notion highlights the importance of teacher-student cooperation in developing teaching-learning materials. Adjusting the materials to the students' needs and interests is significant to the development of students.

Literary education should be reverted to its principles: to create liberating education, thus preventing rigidity, i.e., memorizing theories of literature (this resonates with the notion seen in Saidi's book "*Matinya Dunia Sastra*", 2006). Rigidity in learning is defined as the inability to invent or develop concepts based on everything the students have learned. In other words, the students are lack of courage to express their opinion. Another concern is the lack of litterateurs at universities. This problem blames the paradigm that universities are not the place to produce litterateurs—universities are responsible for producing quality literary teachers. On that ground, authorities should consider giving the freedom to students to determine their learning styles rather than focusing on everything the teachers have assigned, including the freedom to formulate a hypothesis based on the results of learning.

In addition, Siswanto (2008) suggests that literature learning should consider the balance of personality development and competence or intelligence of students; this encompasses spiritual, emotional, language, ethics, logic, aesthetics, and kinesthetic intelligence. All of these aspects have been incorporated in the 2013 Curriculum, in all core competencies (KI-1, KI-2, KI-3, and KI-4). Spiritual intelligence refers to the ability to solve problems using the sense of deeper understanding and the ability to get closer to religious life, other people, nature, and authentic self. Intellectual intelligence is the ability to think and reason, be creative and innovative in solving problems through strategic decisions. Emotional intelligence is the capability to understand oneself and other people. Interpersonal skills encompass several aspects, such as independence, creativity,

productivity, honesty, courage, fairness, sincerity, openness, and self-management. Skills in understanding other people can be acquired through multicultural and intercultural cooperation in society and adaptation skills. Linguistic intelligence involves the ability to comprehend and use languages.

Vocational-kinesthetic intelligence is the ability to utilize the recent communication methods. Literary education requires the participation of litterateurs to provide adequate information regarding the practice of composing literary works. Professionals, including teachers and lecturers, should be prepared to embrace the new era where literature becomes a separate subject.

The assessment of literature learning should focus on the qualities of literary works (appreciation, creativity, and expressiveness). On that ground, the assessment components should examine the performance aspects, such as process, products, and portfolio (Abidin, 2016). Test items in the national examinations should also reflect all components in core and basic competencies.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During the Dutch and Japanese colonialism (1908-1945), the teaching of literature has received attention in addition to natural sciences and socio-economic subjects; literature was under the A category, while the Indonesian language was in C category. However, literature has been incorporated into the Indonesian language class since the New Order these days. Language-focused lessons outnumber the literature-based topics with differences ranging from 3 to 14. Literary education aims at cultivating moral values based on the Youth Pledge, Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, and local wisdom. Literary education is yet to attain its objectives. There are contrastive views on the ideologies, objectives, and assessment of literature learning. As a result, literature learning seems to be less meaningful.

Multiculturalism in literary education requires involvement from all authorities, i.e., teachers, students, school principals, administration staff, and society. This is because multiculturalism in literature learning is a topic worth investigating. Involvement from all authorities is also crucial to prevent conflicts caused by lack of cultural understanding.

Actualizing a liberating, literary education system is not determined by only one aspect, i.e., the teachers' involvement. It is the responsibility of all related parties, e.g., curriculum developers, ministry of education, school principles, and others. It goes without saying that teachers are perplexed by complicated situations. Teachers often go awry. Despite such complexities, teachers should take an emancipatory standpoint. Such a standpoint represents constructive criticism that brings changes in education. Teachers are the agent of changes; they need to change their status quo (or overly-devoted to one regime). Although policies regarding freedom in developing and implementing learning activities have been enacted since the 2004 Curriculum, adapting to changes is not an easy task for some teachers.

REFERENCES

- Abidin, Y. (2012). *Pembelajaran bahasa berbasis pendidikan karakter* [Character education-based language learning]. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Abidin, Y. (2016). *Revitalisasi penilaian pembelajaran dalam konteks pendidikan multiliterasi abad ke-21* [Revitalization of learning assessment in the context of 21st century multiliteracy education]. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Depdiknas. (2004). *Kurikulum 2004: Standar kompetensi mata pelajaran bahasa dan sastra Indonesia sekolah menengah pertama dan madrasah tsanawiyah* [The 2004 Curriculum: competency standards for Indonesian language and literature subjects for junior high schools and its islamic school equivalence]. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas. (2005). *Kurikulum 2004: Standar kompetensi bahan kajian* [Curriculum 2004: Competency standards for learning materials]. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Idi, A. (2007). *Pengembangan kurikulum: Teori & praktik* [Curriculum development: Theory & practice]. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Mahayana, M. S. (2007). *9 Jawaban sastra Indonesia: Sebuah orientasi kritik* [The answer to the Indonesian literature: A critic orientation]. Jakarta: Publishing.
- Mahsun. (2014). *Teks dalam pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia kurikulum 2013* [Texts in Indonesian language learning in the 2013 curriculum]. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo.
- Mulyasa, E. 2013. *Pengembangan dan implementasi kurikulum 2013* [Development and implementation of the 2013 curriculum]. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya .
- Nurdin, S., & Adriantoni. (2016). *Kurikulum dan pembelajaran* [Curriculum and learning]. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo.
- Oemarjati, B. S. (1991). *Pembinaan apresiasi sastra dalam proses belajar mengajar butir-butir sastra dan bahasa: pembaharuan pengajaran* [Fostering literary appreciation in the teaching and learning process of literature and language items: teaching renewal]. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Ratna, N. K.. 2007. *Estetika sastra dan budaya* [Literary and cultural aesthetics]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Saidi, A. I. (2004). *Matinya dunia sastra: Biografi pemikiran & tatapan terberai karya sastra Indonesia* [The death of literature: A biography of Indonesian literary work]. Yogyakarta: Pilar Media.
- Sibarani, R. (2012). *Kearifan lokal: Hakikat, peran, dan metode tradisi lisan* [Local wisdom: The nature, role, and methods of oral traditions]. Jakarta: Asosiasi Tradisi Lisan.
- Siswanto, W. (2008). *Pengantar teori sastra* [Introduction to literature theories]. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R & D* [Qualitative and quantitative research methods and R&D]. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wibowo, A. (2013). *Pendidikan karakter di perguruan tinggi* [Character education in college]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Widyastono, H. (2014). *Pengembangan kurikulum di era otonomi daerah: Dari kurikulum 2004, 2006, ke kurikulum 2013* [Curriculum development in the era of regional autonomy: From the 2004 curriculum, the 2006 curriculum, to the 2013 curriculum]. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.