



CONSTRUCTING LITERARY CANON METRICS FOR PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE

Mohammad Fadli, Endry Boeriswati, Saifur Rohman
Program Studi Doktor Linguistik Terapan, Sekolah Pascasarjana
Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Muhammad_9906922029@mhs.unj.ac.id, endry.boeriswati@unj.ac.id,
saifurrohman@unj.ac.id

Abstract

This study critically investigates the role of the literary canon in secondary school education, focusing on its function as a cultural, ideological, and pedagogical construct. Traditionally regarded as a repository of aesthetic and moral excellence, the literary canon has often been used uncritically as the foundation for literary curricula. However, a recent scholarship reveals that canonical selections are not value-neutral but shaped by institutional authority, sociopolitical dynamics, and dominant ideologies. In the Indonesian context, literary curricula tend to privilege male authors from dominant ethnic and cultural backgrounds, marginalizing voices from women, regional, and minority writers. This imbalance not only limits representation but also fails to resonate with the diverse lived realities of students, thereby reducing literature's transformative potential. Using a Design-Based Research (DBR) approach, this study aims to develop and validate a set of pedagogical competency metrics that enable teachers to critically engage with the canon. Data collection involved curriculum analysis, in-depth interviews with secondary school teachers, and literature reviews across cultural theory, critical pedagogy, and curriculum studies. The research identified three key functions of the canon in education: as cultural heritage, ideological instrument, and pedagogical tool. Correspondingly, three evaluative indicators were developed: the *Cultural Pluralism Index*, the *Ideological Reflexivity Score*, and the *Pedagogical Relevance Scale*. These metrics were tested and refined through focus group discussions and limited field trials in literature classrooms. Findings reveal that when approached reflexively, canonical texts can serve as effective entry points for critical literacy, intercultural dialogue, and ethical awareness. The study concludes that teachers, as critical agents and cultural curators, play a pivotal role in reshaping literary education by integrating alternative voices and encouraging critical engagement with texts. This research contributes both a practical tool for classroom use and a theoretical framework for rethinking literary pedagogy in line with inclusivity, diversity, and social justice.

KEYWORDS

Literary Canon; Canonization; Social Construction; Pedagogical Implementation.

INTRODUCTION

The literary canon has long held a prestigious place in literary studies, serving as a benchmark for cultural values, aesthetic excellence, and pedagogical relevance. Derived from the ancient Greek word *kanon*, meaning "measuring stick", the term has evolved into a standardizing symbol in defining which literary texts are deemed worthy of preservation, study, and transmission (Kolbas, 2001). Within educational institutions, canons have operated both as cultural heritage and as curriculum guides, often used

uncritically to represent a supposedly neutral tradition of literary greatness (Neumann & Rippl, 2017).

In the practice of literary education in secondary schools, the existence of the literary canon is often used as the main reference in determining teaching materials. The canon is seen as a representation of works that have high aesthetic value, moral depth, and significant historical standing, so they deserve to be introduced to students as part of the national cultural heritage. However, the use of canons in the context of learning cannot be separated from structural problems, especially related to text selectivity and representation bias (Bloom, 2014; Guillory, 1994). This indicates that the choice of texts is not always value-neutral but is often influenced by the institutional authority and social constructs that prevail in education.

One of the main problems is the dominance of certain perspectives in the list of literary works that are institutionalized as part of the national curriculum. Research shows that the literary canon used in many secondary schools is dominated by the works of male writers, comes from the majority ethnic group, and reflects the ideology of central cultural nationalism (Guillory, 1994; Kolbas, 2001). In the Indonesian context, the texts that are included in education textbooks are mostly from the Javanese cultural region and curated through institutional lenses, such as government publishers and national curriculum teams. The representation of works from women writers, regional writers, and other marginalized groups has not received an equal place in the structure of the canon taught (Camille, 1996; Gregor Langfeld, 2018).

Gaps also arise in pedagogical practice in the classroom. The dominant learning model still places literary texts as objects to be analyzed structurally, without encouraging students' critical involvement with the ideological and social context of the text (Appleman, 2014). Teachers tend to follow a normative approach to discussing canon texts, where values that are considered universal are imposed without considering the diversity of students' backgrounds. As a result, literary learning tends to lose its reflective and dialogical nature and fails to facilitate meaningful literary experiences for students (Melendez & Beck, 2018).

In addition, there is an inequality between the content of the canon taught and the social reality of students. Many of the selected canonical texts contain cultural backgrounds and historical values that are far from the daily lives of high school students. This incompatibility creates affective and epistemological distance, so that literary texts are no longer able to be a mirror of life or a bridge of intercultural understanding (Appleman, 2014; Said & Clifford, 2008). This also hinders efforts to educate literature as a vehicle to form social awareness and diversity.

Although normatively the national curriculum carries the principles of inclusivity and diversity, its implementation in the field still faces major challenges. Teachers often lack concrete guidance in selecting academically equivalent alternative texts, as well as difficulties in assessing the relevance and quality of texts outside of official lists. The lack of pedagogical metrics or instruments to evaluate the canon based on the criteria of diversity, ideological value, and thematic relevance further widens the gap between curriculum idealization and classroom learning practices (Fuchs et al., 2017; Jansen et al., 2020). Therefore, methodological interventions that compile evaluative indicators on the use of canon are crucial in literary education reform.

This study aims to reconceptualize the literary canon as a socially constructed entity, rather than as a storehouse of universal truth that is fixed and objective. This understanding is in line with the view, who affirms that the canon is a form of *cultural*

capital formed through the mechanism of social, political, and academic legitimacy (Guillory, 1994). By critically examining the process of formation, function, and application of canons in educational contexts, this study proposes a reflective framework that can be used by educators. The framework is designed to support the critical and inclusive use of canons, in line with cultural dynamics and contemporary learning needs (Apple, 2019; Kolbas, 2018). In particular, this study seeks to develop metrics to measure pedagogical competence that allow teachers to evaluate, select, and use canonical texts taking into account reflective, ethical, and contextual aspects. Thus, this approach not only encourages diversity in literary representation, but also increases critical awareness in literary education practices (Jansen et al., 2020; Melendez & Beck, 2018).

The concept of canon is much more than a simple list of exemplary works. The canon operates as a form of cultural capital, giving legitimacy to certain texts while marginalizing others (Guillory, 1994). Early conceptions of the canon, as proposed by Giorgio Vasari emphasized aesthetic achievement but failed to take into account systemic biases in the selection process (Camille, 1996; Gregor Langfeld, 2018).

As studied across scientific traditions, the literary canon is not a neutral list of superior works, but a representation of the cultural and ideological forces underlying the process of selection and exclusion of texts. In many ways, the canon operates as a mechanism of power that not only selects which works are considered "of high value," but also systematically excludes certain voices based on gender, race, class, and geographical origin. Contemporary criticisms of the canonization process reveal that the canon list is not formed in a vacuum, but in a socio-political context full of interests (Bucioni, 2023).

In the history of the Western and Global South canons, women writers and queer identities have consistently been marginalized. In *The Madwoman in the Attic*, it is argued that the Western literary tradition symbolically and structurally confines women in subordinate roles: as written objects, not as writing subjects. This creates an ecosystem that not only excludes women's work from the mainstream, but also marginalizes women's distinctive perspectives, experiences, and narrative forms as "not universal" (Gilbert & Gubar, 2020).

Furthermore, the essay entitled "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?", highlights that the exclusion of women from the grand narrative of art and literary history is not due to the absence of talent, but rather to the absence of access to art institutions and discourse of legitimacy. In the context of secondary education in Indonesia, the selection of literary texts that enter textbooks also features more male writers. Names like Chairil Anwar, Pramoedya Ananta Toer, and Taufik Ismail dominate the reading room, while voices like Nh. Dini and Toeti Heraty — who represent women's perspectives and gender issues—rarely get a prominent place. This imbalance not only closes the space of representation but also hinders learners from understanding the complexity of human experience from various points of view (Nochlin, 2020).

Postcolonial discourse has long criticized the dominance of Eurocentrism in the formation of the literary canon. Edward Said argues that Western representations of Eastern culture are often shaped through the lens of power, where texts from the Eastern world are reduced to exotic, inferior, or even barbaric. This critique paves the way for a rereading of how texts and writers from the Global South—Asia, Africa, Latin America—are systematically excluded from the list of "universal" canons.

Gayatri Spivak asserts that the voices of subalterns, especially Third World women, are often not heard not because they do not speak, but because the prevailing

epistemological system refuses to hear. In the context of education, the selection of literary texts for teaching materials rarely includes works from countries outside the dominant axis of Anglo-American or European. Texts from Africa or Southeast Asia, if any, are often chosen for their cultural uniqueness, not for their critical value or narrative power.

This is exacerbated by the dominance of the global publishing industry that determines which works can penetrate the international market. As noted by in *Recoding World Literature*, globalization in the publishing world strengthens the inequality of cultural representation because distribution and translation are more often given to texts from the center of Western cultural production (Seidel, 2019).

It is important to realize that canonization is not only constructed by literary or academic criticism, but also heavily influenced by educational institutions, major publishers, and state policies. Michael Apple highlights how national curricula often reflect dominant ideologies that reinforce certain narratives while suppressing or eliminating counter-narratives (Apple, 2019). The choice of texts in the curriculum is not the result of neutral scientific selection, but the result of political, economic, and cultural compromise.

This can be observed from high school Indonesian textbooks that tend to display "safe" works—both in terms of ideology and language structure—and avoid texts that challenge social, religious, or political norms. As a result, learners do not get the space to interact with texts that represent minority experiences, class conflicts, or marginal realities.

In addition, the criticism from Luke in *Critical Literacy in Australia* shows that the selection of texts for language and literature teaching is often not based on the cultural diversity of students, but rather on academic norms that are exclusive. This means that students who do not have a dominant cultural background will feel marginalized because they do not see themselves reflected in the texts being taught (Luke, 2018).

Modern criticism highlights the exclusionary mechanisms of canon formation, especially regarding gender, race, class, and geopolitical power. Postcolonial scholars and feminist critics argue that canonical lists have traditionally silenced the voices of women, minorities, and writers from the Global South (Bloom, 2014; Guillory, 1994). In addition, institutional forces—such as academic traditions, publishing practices, state ideologies, and curriculum policies—mediate the process of canonization, often reinforcing dominant cultural narratives.

The pedagogical use of the canon must be understood within this complex matrix. Instead of simply serving as a tool to transmit cultural heritage, the canon can serve as an ideological apparatus. Thus, educators are urged to approach canonical texts with critical awareness, integrating alternative voices and perspectives into their teaching. This pluralistic orientation not only democratizes literary studies but also fosters critical literacy among students.

Canon as an Ideological Apparatus

The literary canon functions not only as a repository of cultural and aesthetic values, but also as an ideological apparatus that works through educational structures, media, and public policy. In this context, Louis Althusser introduced the concept of *Ideological State Apparatuses* (ISA), which are institutions such as schools, families, churches, and mass media that carry out hegemonic roles by subtly and invisibly reproducing dominant ideologies (Althusser, 1970). The literary canon operates within



this ISA as a vehicle to form a view of what is considered to be "universal value", "superior culture", or "national heritage".

Antonio Gramsci, with the concept of *hegemony*, explained that class dominance is not always maintained by coercion, but through cultural consensus created by educational institutions and literary discourse (Gramsci, 1991). The canon, in this case, becomes a hegemonic tool for instilling dominant class or cultural ideology, either consciously or unconsciously. By making certain works the "standard", educational institutions affirm the legitimacy of certain values and worldviews, while excluding alternatives.

In the teaching of literature in secondary schools, this is evident in the selection of texts that tend to be ideologically homogeneous—often conservative, nationalistic, and oriented towards social stability. Social criticism, cultural resistance, or narratives from marginalized groups rarely find a place. Even when such texts make their way into the curriculum, the approach is often reduced to mere structural analysis, without an exploration of the critical values contained in them.

The globalization of education policy often strengthens normative curriculum standardization and suppresses local diversity (Schutz, 2011). This is where it is important to see the canon not as a neutral collection of texts, but as the result of the ideological battles that take place in history and institutions.

Teachers as Critical Agents and Curators

Facing this reality, teachers have a central role as agents of criticism and transformation in the context of literary education. Paulo Freire in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, stated that education should not be "banking"—where teachers instill one-way knowledge to students—but must be dialogical and liberating. In this context, the teaching of literature is not only about memorizing the content of the text, but fostering a critical awareness of the context, representation, and ideology behind the text (Freire Paulo, 1970).

Teachers who are aware of the ideological dimension of the canon can carry out a pedagogical function as *a critical curator* (Giroux, 2005). He not only chooses texts based on the curriculum, but is also able to reflect the social, political, and cultural meanings of the texts in the learning process. Teachers can open up spaces for plural interpretation, invite dialogue between perspectives, and allow students to develop *critical literacy skills*—the ability to read the world critically through text.

Educators become *cultural workers* who realize that every educational action carries an ideological charge (Giroux, 1992). Within this framework, literature teachers are not just the maintainers of old values, but facilitators of new consciousness. Teachers who are aware of the biases in the canon may insert non-canonical texts—such as marginalized women's poetry, indigenous short stories, or postcolonial narratives—to complement dominant literary discourse.

Based on study, shows that students who are guided in a critical literacy approach have higher analytical abilities and stronger social awareness (McLaughlin & DeVoogd, 2004). This shows that the enrichment of the curriculum with alternative texts is not only a matter of representation fairness, but also an effective pedagogical strategy.

Reframing the Curriculum: Pluralism and Representation Justice

The reframing of the curriculum is a concrete step to deal with exclusion in the canon. The importance of students having four skills: code breaker, meaning maker, text

user, and text analyst (Luke, 2018). This last competency—*text analyst*—can only develop if students are given the space to interpret the text critically, considering the social context, ideology, and power structures that shape the text.

Literary learning oriented towards cultural pluralism does not mean replacing the entire canon, but rather recontextualizing its use. Students can be invited to read Chairil Anwar in the context of nationalism as well as compare him with female poets such as Toeti Heraty or Papuan poets such as Jhon R. Arwam. In this comparison, a discussion emerges about differences in historical, gender, or ethnic experiences that enrich literary understanding as a reflection of social complexity.

This kind of learning practice reflects the principle of *intercultural competence*, namely the ability to understand and navigate various cultural perspectives in cross-cultural communication (Byram, 1997). In an increasingly global and pluralistic world, the teaching of literature that is critical of the canon is a way to foster empathy, tolerance, and transnational awareness.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a qualitative approach with a development-based research design strategy, namely *Design-Based Research* (DBR). This approach was chosen because it can combine conceptual product development with theoretical reflection based on real practice in the field of education. The main objective of this study is to construct a set of metrics that can be used to assess teachers' pedagogical competence in teaching canon-based literature in a critical, reflective, and contextual manner.

DBR design is well suited for projects involving curriculum innovation or the development of evaluation tools, which outlines four main stages in DBR, namely: (1) identification and analysis of practical problems in a real context, (2) development of design-based solutions, (3) testing and improvement of solutions in a real environment, and (4) systematic reflection on processes and outcomes to generate theoretical contributions. In the context of this study, the four stages were adapted into a framework for building and testing the metrics of the literary canon (Reeves, 2006).

Problem Identification

The initial stage of this research began with an analysis of the practice of teaching literature at the secondary school level, especially in terms of the selection of literary texts and pedagogical approaches used by teachers. Researchers identified that there is still a strong bias in curricula and textbooks, which tend to feature literary texts from the dominant circle, while voices from cultural, gender, or geographic minority groups are often ignored. This problem is confirmed through literature studies (Appleman, 2014; Schutz, 2011) and initial data collection through curriculum documentation and exploratory interviews with literature teachers in two secondary schools in West Java and Yogyakarta.

Data Collection and Analysis

The main instruments in this study are document analysis, semi-structured in-depth interviews, and theoretical literature studies. The documents analyzed included the literary curriculum, mandatory reading lists, syllabus, and learning modules used by teachers in the classroom. Interviews were conducted with six literature teachers from various backgrounds and teaching experiences. The interview questions are designed to explore teachers' perceptions of the literary canon, text selection, and their approach to



addressing representation and inclusivity in the classroom. All data were analyzed using a thematic analysis method (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which allowed researchers to find relevant patterns, themes, and narratives in forming a metric framework.

Literature studies in this study are carried out systematically on canon and educational theories, as well as contemporary studies on critical literacy and inclusive curriculum. Some of the main literature used includes works by John Guillory, Henry Giroux, Linda Hutcheon, Stuart Hall, as well as methodological books from Creswell, Miles, Huberman & Saldaña, and McKenney & Reeves that specifically address *educational design research*.

Initial Metrics Development

Based on empirical data and literature synthesis, the researcher formulated three main indicators in the pedagogical competency metrics based on the literary canon:

1. The Cultural Pluralism Index, which is a measuring tool to assess the extent to which teachers use texts that represent gender, ethnicity, social class, and geographical diversity in teaching literature.
2. Ideological Reflectivity Score, which is a parameter that assesses teachers' ability to identify and discuss ideologies in literary texts, including hegemonic and counter-hegemonic narratives.
3. The Level of Pedagogical Relevance, which is a measure of the extent to which the text used can answer the learning needs of students, both in terms of language, themes, and the potential for the development of critical thinking.

Each indicator is equipped with a qualitative descriptor and an evaluation rubric that facilitates its practical use in schools.

Validation and Initial Testing

The initial validation of the metrics was carried out through a *focus group discussion* (FGD) with three lecturers of language and literature education from public universities in Indonesia, as well as two teachers who were previously interviewed. This FGD aims to test the clarity of indicators, relevance of context, and their potential application in pedagogical competency evaluation. The results of the FGD show that this metric has conceptual clarity and potential usefulness, although language and format adjustments are needed to make it easier to use in teacher training.

The limited field test was carried out in two literature classes with the participation of teachers who were willing to use metrics as an instrument of learning reflection. Teachers were asked to fill out metrics based on their three-week teaching activities, and provide written feedback on the usability and challenges of using the metrics.

Reflection and Revision

As with the DBR principle, the final stage of this research includes critical reflection on processes and outcomes. This reflection is based on triangulation of data from the results of interviews, FGDs, and field trials. The metrics were then revised to clarify indicators, simplify the language of the instrument, and adapt to the context of the national curriculum.

Thus, this research not only produces an evaluation tool, but also contributes to conceptual thinking about how the literary canon can be used more fairly and critically in education. In line with the suggestion of McKenney and Reeves (2012), DBR contributes

twofold: generating practical innovation and expanding theory in the field of literary education.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, data analysis yielded three central themes that explain the various functions of the literary canon in the context of education. The three themes state that the canon is a cultural heritage, an ideological instrument, and a pedagogical tool that illustrates how complex and multilayered the functions of the canon are in the practice of literary education. These findings then became the basis for the development of a metric framework to evaluate teachers' pedagogical competence in responding to and utilizing canons reflectively.

1. Canon as Cultural Heritage

In many educational institutions, especially at the secondary school level, the literary canon is still positioned as a superior representation of national or even universal cultural heritage. The works of great writers who have been "tested by time", especially from the Western and masculine world, are considered symbols of the great human experience and need to be passed down across generations (Kolbas, 2001; Eagleton, 2008). In this framework, the canon is seen as a "museum" of texts that carry high historical and moral value.

However, this position presents problems in the context of an increasingly multicultural and pluralistic classroom. Traditional views of the canon often ignore the complexity of students' identities and the cultural diversity they bring. As Said (1994) and Spivak (1990) argue, canons that focus too much on Western narratives tend to marginalize literature from the Global South, and do not provide space for local, marginal, or minority life experiences.

In practice, a static canonical approach often fails to establish thematic resonance with students. When students cannot see themselves or their community in the text they read, then the literacy process becomes a process of alienation. According to Ladson-Billings (1995), cultural marginalization in the curriculum is an explicit form of epistemic violence that reinforces structural exclusion. Therefore, there needs to be methodological and pedagogical interventions that emphasize plurality in text selection, in an effort to represent a more equitable and contextually relevant spectrum of human experience.

2. Canon as an Ideological Instrument

Furthermore, the findings of this study show that the literary canon not only serves as a cultural archive, but also serves as an ideological instrument. The selection of texts that are included in the compulsory reading list in schools is often not neutral. The establishment of the literary canon is mediated by a variety of institutional actors—including state institutions, educational institutions, major publishers, and dominant curriculum ideologies—that have specific political, religious, or market interests (Apple, 1993; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010).

Through in-depth interviews with teachers, it was found that in some curricula, texts with nationalistic, conservative, or religious narratives often get priority, while texts that contain social criticism, representation of vulnerable groups, or exploration of non-dominant identities tend to be excluded or avoided. This is in accordance with the findings of Luke (1995), who stated that the curriculum is a hegemonic cultural tool that transmits dominant values while eliminating alternative discourses.



The canon, in this context, serves as a tool to enforce a grand narrative of who "we" are and who "they" are. In other words, the canon becomes an ideological site that actively shapes the collective identity of the nation while excluding experiences that do not conform to the norms legitimized by the state or market (Curry, 2020; Apple, 2014). Therefore, the task of literary education is not enough just to convey the content of the text, but also to analyze how the text negotiates, affirms, or challenges the relationship of power and prevailing values.

3. Canon as a Pedagogical Tool

Although fraught with problems, the canon can still be operated productively in a pedagogical context when used reflexively and critically. Teachers who have ideological awareness and critical pedagogical competence can make canonical texts an entry point for wider discourse exploration. This pedagogical use requires teachers not only to master the content of the text, but also to be able to guide students in developing critical questions, building contextual connections, and presenting counter-narratives (Freire, 1970; Shor, 1992).

For example, teachers may ask students to compare classic literary works with contemporary literary texts from women writers, minority groups, or from underrepresented regions. This dialogical approach allows students to understand not only "what the text says", but also "what it doesn't say", and "why the text says it a certain way". This kind of critical literacy, as emphasized by Janks (2010), not only enhances students' cognitive abilities, but also fosters ethical sensitivity to social justice issues.

Through this process, the canon is seen not as a sacred object that should not be touched, but as a historical construct that can be negotiated and questioned. This approach also opens up space to create an "alternative canon" in the classroom, not as a substitute, but as a complement and counterweight to the dominant narrative.

Development of Pedagogical Competency Metrics

As a follow-up to the above findings, this study developed a metric framework to measure and guide teachers' pedagogical competence in managing the literary canon. This metric is not prescriptive, but heuristic, intended as a tool for reflection and evaluation that is contextual and open to adaptation.

Tiga indikator utama dalam metrik ini adalah:

1. Cultural Pluralism Index (CPI)

This index is used to measure how diverse the corpus of texts teachers choose is in terms of gender representation, ethnicity, social class, and geographic area. Teachers with high CPI scores will tend to present a wider and more representative spectrum of literary works. This is important to create an inclusive and contextual literary curriculum (Banks, 2008; Sleeter, 2011).

2. Ideological Reflexivity Score (IRS)

This score evaluates the extent to which teachers are able to recognize and interrogate dominant values in literary texts, including issues of power, narrative bias, and identity representation. Teachers with high ideological reflexivity will be better able to open up critical discussions about how literature shapes and is influenced by social and political contexts (Apple, 2014; Morrell, 2008).

3. Pedagogical Relevance Scale (PRS)

This indicator measures the relationship between text and students' learning needs and experiences. PRS covers aspects of language accessibility, thematic relevance, and the potential of texts to encourage students' cognitive engagement. This metric responds to real challenges in literary learning, where texts are sometimes too elitist or detached from the world of students' lives (Christenbury, 2011; Bean, 2012).

These three indicators form a single comprehensive framework that can be used by teachers, curriculum developers, or educational trainers to assess and improve the quality of literary pedagogy in the classroom. In the context of national education, these metrics can also be used as a tool in the development of a curriculum that is more responsive to social justice and cultural representation.

CONCLUSION

The literary canon in education is not just a list of excellent works that are passed down from generation to generation, but a social construct that reflects, maintains, and disseminates dominant ideologies. Recent criticisms in cultural studies, feminist theory, and postcolonial studies show that the process of canonization has been carried out through a systemic exclusion mechanism for marginalized identities, including women, ethnic minority groups, the Global South community, and other non-hegemonic oriented groups.

By understanding the canon as an ideological apparatus, teachers and educational institutions are encouraged not to treat it as a static dogma, but as teaching material that must be contextualized critically and reflectively. Within this framework, educators have a central role as agents of change and curators of culture, who not only transfer values, but also challenge and reconstruct dominant narratives for more inclusive and equitable learning.

The practical implications of these findings encourage the development of *pedagogical competency metrics* based on the literary canon that consider three main dimensions: (1) cultural pluralism, i.e. the extent to which the texts taught represent the diversity of human experience; (2) ideological reflectivity, namely the ability of texts and teachers to challenge the dominant narrative structure; and (3) pedagogical relevance, namely the extent to which the text can answer the learning needs of students contextually and critically.

Strengthening critical literacy competencies in secondary education needs to be a priority for the literary curriculum in Indonesia and other countries with pluralistic cultural backgrounds. Learning models such as *critical literacy* (McLaughlin & DeVoogd, 2004), *intercultural competence* (Byram, 1997), and *dialogic pedagogy* approaches (Freire, 1970) can be integrated to ensure that both canonical and non-canonical texts become a means of reflection, dialogue, and social transformation in the classroom.

Facing the global and postcolonial era, literary education can no longer rely on a single legacy, but must be a space for negotiation and the meeting of various voices. Thus, the re-imagining of the canon is not an attempt to dismantle culture, but rather an liberation from the oppressive narrative structure so that the learning space becomes more fair, critical, and humane.

The proposed metrics offer a practical framework for assessing and improving pedagogical competence in the teaching of canon-based literature. It invites educators not only to question the content of the canon but also to rethink the purposes and values that



underpin literary education itself. Thus, this research contributes to a more equitable and dialogical model of literary pedagogy—one that respects diversity, fosters critical thinking, and affirms the cultural identity of all learners.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author expresses his gratitude to the academics who have contributed to the theoretical and conceptual discussions regarding the study of the literary canon, as well as to the teachers who have shared their experiences in interviews and group discussions. Thanks are also expressed to the research and funding institutions that have supported this project technically and intellectually. Not to forget, special awards are given to readers who continue to question, challenge, and re-reflect on existing educational structures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Althusser, L. (1970). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Towards an Investigation on the Reproduction of the Conditions of Production. *Monthly Review Press*, 1–52. <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>
- Apple, W. M. (2019). *Ideology and Curriculum* (4th ed.). Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Ideology-and-Curriculum/Apple-Apple/p/book/9780367023003?srsId=AfmBOoo_7MaDiFKa8fhW2cmSm2f7eIyDGEwtB2HQ7AM0eBiI5wL36rrC
- Appleman, D. (2014). *Critical encounters in secondary English: Teaching literacy theory to adolescents*. books.google.com. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=U8EcBgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=literary+canon&ots=0Rtx8UgxpV&sig=0ipHe2B2-Z3RPOnA9HHER7YD8xc>
- Bloom, H. (2014). *The western canon: The books and school of the ages*. books.google.com. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=bLDqDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT2&dq=literary+canon&ots=4HczcW9XtA&sig=sN3BMNcfl1yzl7d_i6YnBeKr8Ls
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bucaioni, M. (2023). A Transnational Canon of African Literatures in Portuguese?: Mia Couto, José Eduardo Agualusa and the Circulation of Lusophone African Literature. *Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literary Inquiry*, 10(2), 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pli.2023.3>
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assesing Intercultural Communicative Competence Multilingual Matters*. Multilingual Matters. https://spada.uns.ac.id/pluginfile.php/253332/mod_resource/content/1/ICCByram.pdf
- Camille, M. (1996). *Gothic Art : Glorious Visions*. New York: Harry N. Abrams. <https://archive.org/details/gothicartgloriou0000cami/page/n8/mode/1up>
- Freire Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of The Oppressed*. Herder & Herder.
- Fuchs, J. S., Hofer, M. D., Sheth, K. R., Cordon, B. H., Scott, J. M., & ... (2017). Improving outcomes of bulbomembranous urethroplasty for radiation-induced urethral strictures in post-urolume era. *Urology*.

- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0090429516304599>
- Gilbert, S. M., & Gubar, S. (2020). *The madwoman in the attic: The woman writer and the nineteenth-century literary imagination*. books.google.com.
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Cg7UDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=literary+canon&ots=sW14hToP5L&sig=H0GiFpKUULXk0xI_qrkiS_p_uhA
- Giroux, A. H. (1992). *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. Routledge.
- Giroux, A. H. (2005). *Border Crossings Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education. 2nd editio*.
- Gramsci, A. (1991). *Selection From The Prison Notebooks*.
- Gregor Langfeld. (2018). *The canon in art history: concepts and approaches* (pp. 1–18). Journal of Art Historiography. <https://arthistoriography.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/langfeld.pdf>
- Guillory, J. (1994). Cultural Capital, The Problem of Literary Canon Formation. In *University of Chicago* (Vol. 4, Issue 1).
- Jansen, D., Elffers, L., & Volman, M. L. L. (2020). A place between school and home: Exploring the place of shadow education in students' academic lives in the Netherlands. *Orbis Scholae*. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=913443>
- Kolbas, E. D. (2001). *Critical Theori and The Literary Canon*.
- Kolbas, E. D. (2018). *Critical theory and the literary canon*. taylorfrancis.com.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429501197>
- Luke, A. (2018). Genres of power: Literacy education and the production of capital. *Critical Literacy, Schooling, and Social Justice*.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315100951-6>
- McLaughlin, M., & DeVogd, G. (2004). Critical Literacy as Comprehension: Expanding Reader Response. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(1), 52–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1598/jaal.48.1.5>
- Melendez, W. R. De, & Beck, V. (2018). *Teaching young children in multicultural classrooms: Issues, concepts, and strategies*. books.google.com.
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=_g9EDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=P1&dq=multicultural+literacy&ots=-Tpx_hC-Ad&sig=Wv3snucfuWRmM5z1lc3tG0ohH4g
- Neumann, B., & Rippl, G. (2017). Anglophone world literatures: Introduction. *Anglia*, 135(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2017-0001>
- Nochlin, L. (2020). *Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?* 1–10.
- Reeves, T. (2006). Design research from a technology perspective. *Educational Design Research*, 52–66.
- Said, E. W., & Clifford, J. (2008). Culture and Imperialism. In *Vintage Books* (Vol. 27, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1010.2008.00129>
- Schutz, A. (2011). Fazal Rizvi and Bob Lingard: Globalizing education policy. *Journal of Educational Change*, 12(3), 371–375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9169-7>
- Seidel, S. (2019). Konflikte , Kritik und Kanonbildung Zur zeitgenössischen Rezeption der Prosa August Gottlieb Meißners. *Cornova*, 9, 73–93