THE PRODUCTIVE-APPRECIATIVE LITERARY LEARNING MODEL: MITIGATING LANGUAGE TEACHERS' MISCONCEPTIONS IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Dindin Ridwanudin
Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta
E-mail: dindin.ridwanudin@uinjkt.ac.id

Abstract

Literature is an integral component of the Indonesian Language curriculum in elementary schools (SD/MI), playing a strategic role in developing students' linguistic competence, creativity, and character. However, preliminary field observations and teacher interviews indicate that literary learning is predominantly oriented toward cognitive and theoretical aspects, while affective and productive dimensions remain underemphasized. This condition results in literary instruction that is less meaningful and fails to foster students' appreciation and creative expression. This study aims to analyze the urgency of positioning literature as a foundation for language learning in elementary education and to propose a Productive–Appreciative Literary Learning Model tailored to students' developmental characteristics. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach, data were collected through classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with elementary school teachers, and document analysis. The findings reveal that literature-based learning effectively integrates language skills and supports character development when implemented through balanced appreciative and productive activities. The proposed model emphasizes dialogic literary appreciation and creative production through prose, poetry, and drama, with adaptive strategies suitable for elementary learners. This model offers a conceptual contribution to strengthening meaningful, student-centered literary learning in primary education.

Keywords: literary learning, productive–appreciative model, language education, elementary school, character development

Dindin Ridwanudin

INTRODUCTION

In the context of the *Kurikulum Merdeka*, literature holds a strategic position within Indonesian language learning at the Elementary and Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (SD/MI) levels. Beyond enriching linguistic competence, literature serves a dual function as a medium for character formation and as a means of developing communicative skills. Through literary engagement, students are expected to cultivate empathy, moral awareness, and cultural appreciation while using authentic language in meaningful situations.

Recent studies confirm that many teachers still approach literature as a predominantly theoretical subject rather than an experiential and expressive learning process. Suryaman et al., (2021) emphasize that literature teaching in Indonesian schools often lacks meaningful engagement because teachers rely heavily on traditional text-centered instruction instead of integrating multimodal, interactive, and student-centered practices.

Literary works provide authentic language material rich in vocabulary, sentence variety, and rhetorical style, enabling students to acquire language in context. Appreciation activities such as dramatizing stories or reciting poems simultaneously strengthen speaking, listening, and writing abilities. Consistent engagement with literary texts significantly reinforces vocabulary development, as demonstrated by findings that regular short story reading substantially increases elementary students' lexical repertoire (Misriandi at.al, 2024). These findings reinforce the role of literary engagement as a catalyst for multidimensional language growth. Consequently, literature should function not only as an object of analysis but as the foundation of functional language practice.

The dual role of literature as a builder of character and a developer of language proficiency makes its position in the elementary curriculum both strategic and indispensable. Recent evidence shows that literature-based instruction meaningfully supports holistic language development by integrating comprehension, expression, and cultural reflection. Utami & Mahardika, (2023) further demonstrate that when teachers adopt literature-centered pedagogical strategies, classroom engagement increases and students participate more actively in constructing meaning. These findings affirm that literature remains one of the most powerful vehicles for achieving meaningful, student-centered Indonesian-language learning. Therefore, it must be treated as a fundamental basis integrating cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects.

Deviation from this holistic orientation leads to systematic failure in achieving literature's twin objectives, a problem analyzed in subsequent sections. When instruction privileges formal, declarative tasks (e.g., defining literary devices or enumerating genres) over embodied, interpretive activities, students' affective engagement diminishes and motivation declines. As a result, literature learning often becomes formulaic rather than transformative. This approach views literature as an object of knowledge rather than a subject of experience, distancing students from appreciation and creativity the very essence of primary-level literary

learning. Therefore, current practice in SD/MI literature instruction demands an urgent paradigm shift. Literature must be taught through a model that privileges *doing* over merely *knowing.*

Recent scholarship has reconceptualized literacy instruction as not merely a cognitive exercise, but a healing space for students who have experienced trauma. Panther & Tolefree, (2022) argues that trauma-informed literacy practices enable students to center personal stories in writing and reading, thereby fostering both trust and individual agency. Complementing this, suggests that trauma-informed writing pedagogy emphasizes safety, relational trust, and emotionally attuned classroom spaces, which help vulnerable student writers find their voice and resilience. Together, these perspectives support a pedagogy of care in which literacy becomes a tool for emotional recovery and empowerment. When teachers focus on rote learning and structural analysis, they neglect the affective and psychomotor goals: cultivating love of literature and stimulating the creation of literary works. Consequently, literature risks becoming a dry and irrelevant subject for young learners.

Empirical studies emphasize that literary reading is a powerful medium for nurturing students' emotional and interpersonal development. Noviadi et al., (2023) demonstrate that engagement with narrative texts enhances learners' reflective thinking, emotional sensitivity, and interpersonal awareness dimensions that closely relate to empathy formation. Their findings reaffirm that literature learning should not be limited to cognitive analysis but must open space for emotional experience and personal interpretation. Moreover, widespread misconceptions related to fundamental linguistic elements-particularly sentence structure-indicate significant teacher unpreparedness. Findings by Septiana & Ripai, (2021) show that many teachers still struggle to distinguish core syntactic patterns, limiting their ability to facilitate expressive, creative, and meaning-oriented language instruction. Students thus remain unable to employ literature as a medium for articulating ideas or producing new works-a capacity central to productive literacy.

Therefore, current practice in SD/MI literature instruction demands an urgent paradigm shift. Literature must be taught through a model that privileges doing over merely knowing. Teachers ideally take on the role of facilitators who guide students through both appreciative and productive literary activities including critical reading, emotional response, reflective discussion, poetry writing, dramatization, and storytelling. Studies on project- and literature-based learning indicate that when teachers scaffold such activities, students become more engaged and creative (Wulandari & Wilyanti, 2023, Sutarini et al., 2024). Without this transformation, literature will continue to be perceived as a cognitive burden, obstructing the holistic aims of language education.

The dual role of literature as a builder of character and a developer of language proficiency makes its position in the elementary curriculum both strategic and indispensable.

Recent evidence shows that literature-based instruction creates rich opportunities for students to engage emotionally, socially, and linguistically. Utami & Mahardika, (2023) highlight that teachers who integrate literature meaningfully observe higher student engagement, deeper comprehension, and more authentic language use, demonstrating literature's essential role in achieving holistic learning outcomes. Within the framework of language-acquisition theory, literary texts provide linguistically rich, comprehensible input that is slightly above students' current level (*i + 1*). Simultaneously, drawing on Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, literature creates a mediative social context in which language learning moves from the interpersonal to the intrapersonal plane (Vygotsky et al., 1978).

Authentic literary materials—short stories, folktales, and poems—offer linguistic and stylistic richness that cannot be replicated by standard textbooks. Their sustained use provides learners with varied vocabulary, natural sentence patterns, and expressive forms. Misriandi at.al, (2024) show that exposure to narrative texts fosters measurable improvement in students' vocabulary mastery. As a result, learners are better equipped to produce coherent and expressive sentences in their own writing and oral expression. Through literature, students implicitly absorb linguistic patterns and stylistic nuances that support both comprehension and production.

Appreciation activities such as dramatization, role-play, and poetry recitation remain powerful avenues for strengthening oral language and psychomotor skills. Recent studies show that drama-based pedagogy enhances communicative competence by integrating emotional, social, and kinesthetic engagement. Alam et al., (2020) demonstrate that process drama supports expressive language use and helps learners articulate complex ideas in ways that traditional methods do not. Similarly, (McDonnell & O'Boyle, 2021) report that drama-oriented activities significantly improve learner participation and interaction, making literary appreciation more experiential and meaningful. Performing literature encourages spontaneous language use in a supportive atmosphere, promoting fluency and interactive listening while transforming passive linguistic knowledge into functional communication.

Furthermore, literature provides a strong foundation for developing both critical reading and productive writing skills. Engagement with texts through a reader-response lens encourages learners to interpret, evaluate, and connect ideas personally processes that naturally strengthen their ability to craft coherent arguments and use language more purposefully. Recent studies show that when students respond aesthetically to literary texts, they develop heightened stylistic awareness and produce more expressive, imaginative written work (Adewoye, 2022). Thus, literature becomes a platform not only for comprehension but for creative expression.

Beyond linguistic benefits, literature also contributes to character and affective development. Recent research by Noviadi et al., (2023) shows that literary texts enable students to explore moral dilemmas, emotions, and diverse human experiences, supporting teachers in fostering character values and emotional resilience. Such evidence confirms the significance of

literature as an educational tool that shapes not only language proficiency but holistic learner development. This violates the holistic principle of language education, which interweaves linguistic competence with personal growth and humanity. Consequently, students may *know about* literature but fail to *feel* it, undermining the intended goals of character formation.

A decisive paradigm shift is therefore essential: from teaching literature as information to teaching it as action and process. Constructivist learning theory affirms that knowledge, including literary literacy, is built through direct experience and interaction Vygotsky et al., (1978). Accordingly, curriculum design should foreground experiential approaches such as process drama and project-based learning, which require learners to use language and literature functionally rather than memorizing content. Evidence from McDonnell & O'Boyle, (2021) shows that process drama creates authentic communicative situations that promote interaction, negotiation of meaning, and deeper engagement with literary texts. Such approaches align with the goal of transforming literature learning into a participatory, collaborative, and linguistically rich experience.

This paradigm shift calls for the development of a clearly articulated Productive–Appreciative Literary Learning Model that equips teachers to move from traditional toward student-centered literary pedagogy. Such development requires a comprehensive needs analysis for both teachers and students, especially to address the conceptual misconceptions identified by (Septiana & Ripai, 2021) regarding basic linguistic understanding, ensuring that instructional principles remain pedagogically sound and contextually relevant.

In this model, literature should form the foundation for developing comprehensive language skills. By combining literary appreciation (deep, contextual interpretation) with creative production (writing, dramatization, storytelling), students have opportunities to exercise listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in authentic, meaningful contexts an approach shown to improve language competence in project-based literature instruction (Wulandari & Wilyanti, 2023, Sutarini et al., 2024). Only through such an action- and process-based model can students achieve competencies that not only meet curricular demands but also equip them with linguistic proficiency and moral character for lifelong learning.

METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design supported by a Systematic Literature Review (SLR). The research does not aim to empirically test or statistically validate a learning model; rather, it seeks to conceptually formulate and theoretically substantiate a Productive–Appreciative Literary Learning Model for Primary Education (SD/MI). The conceptual design allows the researcher to critically examine discrepancies between curricular mandates, theoretical foundations, and classroom practices, while the SLR functions as an

analytical instrument to ensure that the proposed model is grounded in established scholarly evidence.

This methodological orientation is consistent with educational research that prioritizes theoretical synthesis, pedagogical gap analysis, and instructional model development, particularly in contexts where conceptual clarification and paradigm transformation are required before empirical testing.

Data Sources and Review Focus

The study relies exclusively on secondary data obtained from academic and policy-related sources. To ensure analytical coherence, the reviewed literature was categorized into three main analytical foci:

a. Curricular and Pedagogical Gap Focus

This category includes Indonesian Language Curriculum documents for Primary Education (SD/MI) and peer-reviewed journal articles discussing the implementation of literature learning, teachers' pedagogical misconceptions, and the limited achievement of affective and psychomotor learning domains in literature instruction.

b. Theoretical Foundation Focus

This focus encompasses books and scholarly articles presenting core theories relevant to the study, including literary didactics, reader-response theory (Rosenblatt's Transactional Theory), language acquisition theory (Krashen's Input Hypothesis), and sociocultural learning theory (Vygotsky). These sources provide the conceptual and theoretical grounding for integrating appreciation and production in literary learning.

c. Instructional Model and Action-Oriented Learning Focus

This category includes recent empirical and conceptual studies on innovative, experience-based instructional models, such as drama pedagogy, process drama, and project-based literary learning, which integrate affective engagement and productive language use.

Data Collection Procedure (Systematic Literature Review)

The SLR followed a transparent and replicable procedure adapted to the objectives of conceptual educational research. Rather than aiming for statistical aggregation or meta-analysis, the review prioritized theoretical relevance, pedagogical contribution, and contextual suitability for primary education.

The procedure involved the following stages:

a. Literature Searching

Literature searches were conducted using keyword combinations such as *"literary learning," "teacher misconception," "productive–appreciative model," "literature-based instruction,"* and *"sastra*

SD/MI." Searches were performed across major academic databases, including Google Scholar, SINTA, Scopus, and ERIC.

b.   Screening and Selection

Inclusion criteria were limited to peer-reviewed publications published between 2009 and 2024 that addressed (a) primary education contexts, (b) literature or language learning pedagogy, or (c) relevant theoretical frameworks. Sources lacking methodological clarity, academic rigor, or relevance to instructional design were excluded.

c.   Data Extraction

From each selected source, key analytical information was systematically extracted, including: 1) identified pedagogical gaps or misconceptions, 2) theoretical principles related to affective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains, and 3) instructional components of action-oriented or literature-based learning models.

This process ensured methodological transparency while maintaining flexibility appropriate for conceptual synthesis.

Data Analysis Technique (Conceptual Synthesis)

Data were analyzed using a conceptual synthesis technique, aimed at producing a coherent theoretical justification and a structured instructional model. The analysis was conducted through three interrelated stages:

a.   Gap Analysis

Data from curricular documents and classroom-based studies were compared with established theoretical principles to identify inconsistencies between the intended function of literature in the curriculum and its actual classroom implementation. This analysis revealed the root causes of teachers' pedagogical misconceptions and the systematic neglect of affective and psychomotor learning objectives.

b.   Theoretical Integration

Core principles from Rosenblatt's Transactional Theory, Krashen's Input Hypothesis, and Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory were synthesized to construct a unified pedagogical foundation. This integration explains how aesthetic appreciation (personal and emotional response) and productive activity (creative and communicative action) can function synergistically in literature-based language learning.

c.   Conceptual Model Formulation

Based on the results of the gap analysis and theoretical synthesis, the Productive–Appreciative Literary Learning Model was formulated. The model delineates its pedagogical principles, learning phases, teacher roles, and expected learning outcomes aligned with the Kurikulum Merdeka. At this stage, the model serves as a conceptual

instructional framework, providing a theoretically grounded basis for future empirical validation and classroom-based implementation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this conceptual study, the term *results* refers to the outcomes of systematic conceptual synthesis derived from curriculum documents, theoretical frameworks, and empirical findings reported in prior studies, rather than from primary field data. Accordingly, the discussion presents analytically constructed findings in the form of identified pedagogical gaps, theoretical alignments, and implications for instructional model development. This approach is consistent with conceptual educational research in which results emerge from critical comparison, integration, and interpretation of scholarly evidence.

Gap Analysis: Pedagogical Misconception and the Failure of Holistic Literary Objectives

1) *Curricular Mandate and the Dual Function of Literature in Primary Education*

Within the *Kurikulum Merdeka*, literature is positioned as a core and strategic component of Indonesian language learning in Elementary and Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (SD/MI) education. Conceptual synthesis of curriculum documents and recent empirical studies confirms that literacy in primary education is intended to function as a multidimensional competence encompassing linguistic, cognitive, affective, and moral development. Studies by Linggar et al. (2024) and Lisnawaty (2024) demonstrate that meaningful reading activities grounded in whole-language and literacy oriented approaches contribute significantly to reading comprehension and learning readiness. Furthermore, Haqi et al. (2025) show that Indonesian elementary textbooks incorporate diverse literary genres aligned with students' developmental stages, reinforcing literature's potential as a vehicle for contextualized language and character education.

However, the synthesis also reveals a persistent discrepancy between curricular ideals and classroom practices. Despite the curriculum's holistic orientation, classroom instruction frequently emphasizes cognitive mastery such as memorizing literary terms or identifying textual elements while marginalizing affective engagement and productive expression (Rahman et al., 2023). This imbalance indicates that literature's dual function as a medium for language development and character formation is rarely realized in practice. As a result, literature is often reduced to an assessment-oriented subject rather than utilized as a meaningful pedagogical foundation.

2) *Fundamental Misconception: Literature as an Object of Knowledge*

The conceptual synthesis of curriculum analyses and classroom-based studies reveals a deep-rooted pedagogical misconception: literature is predominantly treated as an object of

declarative knowledge rather than as a lived, interpretive, and experiential practice. Suryaman et al. (2021) argue that effective literature instruction should position texts as spaces for dialogue, emotional engagement, and multimodal interpretation. Nevertheless, many teachers continue to assume that literary appreciation will automatically develop once students master definitions and analytical terminology.

Instruction dominated by theoretical exercises such as listing intrinsic elements or defining poetic devices produces sterile learning experiences. Empirical findings reported by Arnisyah et al. (2023) indicate that such text-centered practices restrict students' aesthetic response and emotional involvement, distancing learners from literature's expressive essence. Consequently, students learn *about* literature rather than *through* literature, resulting in diminished intrinsic motivation and limited creative response.

This misconception constructs an artificial distance between reader and text, suppressing affective resonance and creative engagement. The synthesis therefore identifies cognition-centered pedagogy as the primary obstacle preventing literature from fulfilling its holistic educational function.

3) *Violation of the Principle of Holism and the Failure of the Affective Domain*

When curricular objectives and classroom practices are examined through conceptual gap analysis, a clear violation of the holistic principle of language education becomes evident. Meaningful literary learning requires the integration of linguistic competence with emotional and moral engagement. However, the dominance of cognitive oriented instruction marginalizes affective learning processes.

Noviadi et al. (2023) demonstrate that students develop deeper comprehension and moral sensitivity when literary instruction includes reflective discussion, emotional response, and personal interpretation. Conversely, Nurcholis and Imran (2024) emphasize that the absence of literary appreciation weakens character formation, as students are not encouraged to internalize values experientially. As a result, learners may recognize narrative conflict or moral messages cognitively but fail to empathize with characters or reflect on ethical implications.

This condition produces a form of affective disengagement in which literature loses its transformative potential. Theory-driven but experience-poor instruction strips literary texts of their emotional core, preventing students from developing inner sensitivity and moral awareness. Restoring this balance requires a pedagogical model that intentionally activates aesthetic response as an essential learning outcome.

4) *Psychomotor Failure and the Functional Degradation of Literature*

The neglect of the affective domain directly contributes to psychomotor underdevelopment and weak productive literacy. Without emotional investment, students lack motivation to engage in expressive action. Conceptual synthesis of literature on communicative

language teaching in Indonesia indicates that although communicative principles are widely endorsed, their classroom implementation remains limited due to instructional routines that prioritize passive knowledge acquisition (Rizqi, 2020).

As a result, literary texts that should serve as springboards for authentic communication such as dramatization, storytelling, and creative writing are reduced to inert content. Septiana and Ripai (2021) further document teachers' conceptual difficulties with basic linguistic structures, which constrain their ability to scaffold expressive and meaning-driven instruction. This pedagogical unpreparedness inhibits literature's function as a medium for productive language use.

Nevertheless, the synthesis affirms that literature provides rich, authentic linguistic input capable of supporting integrated listening, speaking, reading, and writing development (Musthafa, 2001). When used functionally, literary texts facilitate meaningful language encounters that strengthen both comprehension and production. Thus, the failure lies not in literature itself, but in the way it is pedagogically enacted.

Theoretical Synthesis: Conceptual Foundation of the Productive–Appreciative Model

1) *The Appreciative Component: Reader-Response Orientation*

The Appreciative component of the proposed model is grounded in reader-response pedagogy, which conceptualizes meaning-making as an active transaction between reader, text, and experience. Rather than limiting instruction to information extraction, this orientation emphasizes aesthetic engagement, emotional connection, and collaborative interpretation. Conceptual synthesis of recent studies confirms that when teachers foreground personal response and interpretive dialogue, literature becomes an effective medium for character and language development (Utami & Mahardika, 2023).

By operationalizing aesthetic response, the appreciative phase addresses the affective domain that is frequently neglected in conventional instruction. Students are positioned as co-constructors of meaning, fostering empathy, sensitivity, and interpretive awareness the core objectives of literary education at the primary level.

2) *The Productive Component: Language Acquisition and Sociocultural Perspectives*

The Productive component is theoretically anchored in the integration of Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory. Conceptual synthesis of language acquisition literature confirms that while comprehensible input is essential, language development is most effective when learners are engaged in socially mediated, meaningful production. Recent discussions (Chen et al., 2024; Nguyen & Doan, 2025) further emphasize that interaction, embodiment, and authentic communication are critical for transforming input into functional competence.

Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) underscores the importance of instructional scaffolding in guiding learners from comprehension toward creative and independent expression. Empirical evidence synthesized by Bakri et al. (2023) supports this view, demonstrating that scaffolded literary engagement enables students to progress from basic understanding to expressive performance. Together, these theoretical perspectives justify the integration of productive activities as a central component of literature-based language learning.

3) *Action Strategy: Drama Pedagogy as an Integrative Method*

The synthesis further indicates that bridging appreciation and production requires an embodied pedagogical strategy. Drama-based instruction provides such a bridge by integrating cognitive, affective, and psychomotor dimensions within a single learning process. Studies by Alam et al. (2020) and McDonnell and O'Boyle (2021) demonstrate that process drama transforms literary learning into authentic communicative practice, enabling students to experience texts through performance, role engagement, and collaborative meaning-making.

Drama pedagogy reduces affective barriers and encourages spontaneous language use, aligning with Krashen's affective filter hypothesis. By engaging learners physically and emotionally, drama-based strategies operationalize literature as lived experience rather than abstract content.

4) *Model Formulation: Components and Operational Steps*

It is important to clarify that the Productive–Appreciative Literary Learning Model proposed in this study is a conceptual model derived from systematic theoretical synthesis. At this stage, the model functions as a pedagogical framework rather than an empirically tested instructional intervention. Its primary contribution lies in offering a theoretically grounded structure that addresses identified pedagogical gaps. Empirical validation through classroom-based implementation and design-based research is therefore recommended for future studies.

The model adopts a cyclic and holistic structure in which appreciative engagement naturally leads to productive expression and reflective internalization. This design ensures coherence between affective engagement, psychomotor activity, and moral reflection, positioning literature as the functional foundation for integrated language learning.

5) *Relevance of the Synthesis for Gap Closure*

The conceptual alignment achieved through this synthesis confirms that the identified pedagogical gaps, theoretical foundations, and proposed instructional components are systematically connected through the adopted conceptual–systematic review methodology. By integrating appreciation and production within a single instructional framework, the model addresses both affective disengagement and psychomotor underdevelopment that characterize current literature instruction in SD/MI contexts.

Ultimately, the Productive Appreciative Model restores literature to its intended dual function as a medium for language development and character formation. It reframes literature learning as an action-based, experience-driven process aligned with the principles of the Kurikulum Merdeka, providing a coherent foundation for future empirical exploration.

Model Formulation: Components and Operational Steps

1) *Model Concept and Pedagogical Paradigm Transformation*

The dual role of literature as a builder of character and a developer of language proficiency makes its position in the elementary curriculum both strategic and indispensable. Recent classroom-based studies demonstrate that literature can meaningfully support holistic Indonesian-language learning when it is taught through experiential and student-centered approaches. Utami & Mahardika, (2023) found that literature-based instruction enhances student engagement, strengthens linguistic expression, and allows learners to explore values and identities through narrative forms, making literature a core pedagogical resource rather than a peripheral enrichment. The teacher's role transforms from information deliverer to facilitator of creative experience.

Cyclic and holistic in design, the model ensures that appreciation activities lead naturally into production activities, integrating affective and psychomotor domains. Literature thus becomes the functional foundation for developing listening, speaking, reading, and writing competence.

2) *Operational Phases and Holistic Domain Implementation*

The model consists of three interrelated phases, each targeting a specific learning domain:

Phase	Domain Focus	Key Action (Doing Focus)	Key Output / Next Input
I. Receptive Appreciation (Aesthetic)	Affective	Conduct aesthetic critical reading (Rosenblatt); connect emotions and personal experiences.	Inner empathy and initial interpretation.
II. Productive Appreciation (Action)	Psychomotor	Perform dramatization, role-play, or creative text production (Vygotsky, Krashen).	Functional communication and creative expression.

III. Reflection and Transfer	Cognitive–Moral	Conduct metacognitive reflection linking values to real life	Character internalization and readiness for new cycle.

The model's cyclic structure guarantees coherence: affective engagement leads to creative expression, culminating in moral reflection.

3) Implementation Requirements and the Teacher's Role

Recent research emphasizes the necessity of converting theoretical aims into experience-driven classroom routines. Hasan et al., (2023) shows that experiential learning cycles (experience → reflection → abstraction → experimentation) significantly increase students' communicative output and collaborative skills. Complementing this, Suryaman et al., (2021) argue that literature and language lessons that incorporate multimedia and action-based projects produce greater engagement and practical language use among primary learners. Together, these studies suggest that literature instruction should shift from static analysis to guided, experience-based practices that prompt both aesthetic appreciation and functional language production.

The model includes detailed procedural guidance to minimize methodological confusion and support the transition from traditional to experience-centered pedagogy. Though conceptually validated, it must undergo expert review and pilot testing to adapt to diverse SD/MI contexts.

4) Holistic Implications and Gap Closure

The dual role of literature as both a vehicle for character formation and a medium for language development makes it strategically indispensable in the elementary curriculum. Recent studies of school-based literacy programs show that sustained, curriculum-aligned literary activities (story reading, guided discussion, and school library programs) contribute directly to students' socio-emotional development and moral awareness (Mukarromah et al., 2023). In line with this, research on literacy-based character education demonstrates that deliberately designed literacy activities when scaffolded by teachers can strengthen virtues such as empathy, responsibility, and social awareness while also supporting language skills (Syamsuriyanti & Padipa, 2023).

Ultimately, the model restores literature to its ideal dual function developing language proficiency and shaping character. It resolves long-standing pedagogical misconceptions by transforming literary learning into a holistic, action-based experience aligned with Kurikulum Merdeka principles.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms a fundamental and systematic gap in literature instruction at the Elementary and *Madrasah Ibtidaiyah* levels. The root of this gap lies in a persistent pedagogical misconception in which teachers treat literature merely as theoretical knowledge (*knowing*) rather than as lived experience (*doing*). This misconception violates the holistic principle of language education and consistently obstructs the attainment of curricular objectives particularly in the affective domain (empathy and character development) and the psychomotor domain (productive literacy). Consequently, a paradigm transformation from information-based teaching to action- and experience-based pedagogy is urgently required.

In response to this issue, the present research conceptually formulates the Productive–Appreciative Literary Learning Model. This model is theoretically validated through an integrative synthesis of Rosenblatt's Transactional Theory of Literature, which promotes aesthetic response and personal appreciation, and the Sociocultural and Language Acquisition frameworks (Vygotsky; Krashen), which emphasize social interaction, comprehension, and active production. The model is cyclic in nature, guiding teachers through an iterative process that transforms literary appreciation into productive linguistic performance.

The principal contribution of this model lies in its operational clarity and pedagogical applicability. By positioning literature as the functional foundation of language learning, the model bridges emotional engagement (*appreciation*) and linguistic output (*production*). This alignment ensures that students develop balanced competencies across listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills while internalizing moral and cultural values through meaningful experience.

In its broader implication, the *Productive–Appreciative Model* provides teachers with a clear framework to transform literature from a passive subject of knowledge into an active medium of communication, creativity, and character formation. Implementing this model will equip students with both linguistic capital and character capital, fulfilling literature's dual role as mandated by the *Kurikulum Merdeka* and the national education vision.

REFERENCES

Adewoye, A. T. (2022). *Application of Reader-Response Theory in EFL Teaching and Learning in Nigeria* (Vol. 3, Issue 2). https://foster.pbi-iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/contents/article/view/68?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Alam, S., Karim, M. R., & Ahmad, F. (2020). *Process drama as a method of pedagogy in ESL classrooms: articulating the inarticulate*. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5710-7800

Arnisyah, S., & Dwi Syafutri, H. (2023). *Implementation of Literature Learning in Elementary Schools*. https://journal.umpr.ac.id/

Sutarini, S., Rosadi, M., & Juwita, P. (2024). Penerapan Model Project Based Learning (PjBL) untuk Meningkatkan Kreativitas Mahasiswa Mendesain Media. In *Jurnal Pendidikan West Science* (Vol. 02, Issue 02). https://wnj.westsciences.com/index.php/jpdws/article/view/1226?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Carvalho, L., & Yeoman, P. (2021). Performativity of Materials in Learning: The Learning-Whole in Action. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, *10*(1), 28–42. https://doi.org/10.7821/NAER.2021.1.627

Chen, S., Hu, Z., Kang, S., & Wang, A. (2024). *Krashen's Input Hypothesis Revisited: Current Perspectives and Future Directions*. https://www.deanfrancispress.com/index.php/al/article/view/659?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Haqi, S. A., Wibowo, S. E., Hastuti, W. S., Wuriyandani, W., & Fauziah, M. (2025). Exploring Children's Literature Content in Indonesian Textbooks for Elementary Schools: Insights from the Merdeka Curriculum. *Jurnal Paedagogy*, *12*(4), 1114–1127. https://doi.org/10.33394/jp.v12i4.16951

Hasan, M., Arisah, N., Ratnah S, Ahmad, M. I. S., & Miranda. (2023). Experiential Learning Model for the Development of Collaborative Skills through Project Based Learning Practicum. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, *12*(2), 340–349. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpiundiksha.v12i2.57376

Kurniawati, N. (2021). Undrestanding Krashen Hypothesis of Second Language Acquisition: A Case Study of A Polyglot. *IJLECR - International Journal of Language Education and Culture Review*, *7*(1), 83–89. https://doi.org/10.21009/ijlecr.071.08

Linggar, D., Ahmad, A., Malik, M., Falah, N., & Dewi, R. (2024). Keterampilan Membaca dalam Pebelajaran Bahasa Indonesia pada Siswa Kelas IV SD. *Cendikia Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, *2*, 275. https://jurnal.kolibi.org/index.php/cendikia/article/view/911?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Lisnawaty, S. D. (2024). A Systemic Analysis of Literature Review Strategies For Implementing Out-of-School Education in Remote Areas. *JKPP (Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Dan Psikologi)*, *1*(3). https://altinriset.com/journal/index.php/jkpp

Marfuah, J., & Patmasari, A. (2020). The Effect of Using Drama Technique towards the Students' Speaking Accuracy, Fluency, and Comprehensibility. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies on Humanities*, *3*(1), 97–109. https://doi.org/10.34050/els

McDonnell, D., & O'Boyle, A. (2021). Process drama in the classroom. *Scenario: A Journal of Performative Teaching, Learning, Research*, 56–75. https://doi.org/10.33178/scenario.15.1.3

Misriandi, & Maulana Hendrawan, G. (2024). Pengaruh Literasi Membaca Cerita Pendek Terhadap Pengembangan Kosakata Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *Atmosfer: Jurnal Pendidikan, Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Budaya, Dan Sosial Humaniora*, *2*(2), 168–175. https://doi.org/10.59024/atmosfer.v2i2.788

Musthafa, B. (2001). *Communicative Language Teaching in Indonesia: Issues of Theoretical Assumtions and Challanges in the Classroom Practice.*

Mukarromah, N., Sugito, & Mukti, R. C. (2023). A Systematic Review: Development of Literature Capacity in Elementary School. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review*, *6*(2), 343–355. https://doi.org/10.23887/ijerr.v6i2.54037

Nguyen, Q. N., & Doan, D. T. H. (2025). Beyond comprehensible input: a neuro-ecological critique of Krashen's hypothesis in language education. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 16). Frontiers Media SA. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1636777

Noviadi, A., Sumiyadi, & Permadi, T. (2023). The Role of Literature Teaching in Improving Students' Language Skills. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *22*(3), 278–293. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.3.17

Nurcholis, & Imran, &. (2024). Peran Apresiasi Sastra dalam Pembentukan Karakter Siswa. *Wahana Literasi*, *4*(2). https://ojs.unm.ac.id/wahanaliterasi

Panther, L., & Tolefree, L. (2022). Youth Testimony Contend with Trauma. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, *18*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1358429.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Rahman, H., Wirawati, D., Nur, J., Sidiq, A., Pbsi,), Yani, J. A., Tamanan, B., & Bantul, Y. (2023). *Pembentukan Karakter Melalui Pembelajaran Sastra Berbasis Ekologis dalam Kumpulan Cerita Rakyat Nusantara.* https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/penaliterasi

Rizqi, M. A. (2020). A Critical Review of the Communicative Language Teaching Implementation in Indonesia. *Capeu Journal of Education*, *1*(2), 38–43. https://doi.org/10.17509/cje.v1i2.31842

Septiana, I., & Ripai, A. (2021). Miskonsepsi Guru Pada Pemahaman Materi Bahasa Indonesia Pokok Bahasan Kalimat. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.31571/bahasa.v10i1.1842

Suryaman, M., Wiyatmi, Pujiono, S., & Kristiyani, A. (2021). Redefining language and literature learning in the transformation era. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(3), 687–696. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31755

Syamsuriyanti, S., & Padipa, S. S. (2023). Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter Berbasis Literasi pada Murid Sekolah Dasar. *JUDIKDAS: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dasar Indonesia*, *2*(2), 75–84. https://doi.org/10.51574/judikdas.v2i2.892

Utami, I. L. P., & Mahardika, I. G. N. A. (2023). English Teaching Through Literature-Based Instruction: What do Teachers Experience? *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, *7*(2), 177–186. https://doi.org/10.23887/jppp.v7i2.64368

Vygotsky, L. S., Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S., & Souberman, E. (1978). *Mind in Society The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*.

Wulandari, S., & Wilyanti, L. S. (2023). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Berbasis Proyek untuk Meningkatkan Aktivitas dan Keterampilan Analisis Sastra. *Pena : Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *13*(1), 32–48. https://doi.org/10.22437/pena.v13i1.29624