

The Effectiveness of the Creative Writing Learning Model Based on the Literacy Approach

Muh. Faisal*, Afdhal Fatawuri Syamsuddin, Ahmad Ardillah Rahman, and Sayidiman

Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

*muh.faisal@unm.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article history: Received: March 8, 2026 Accepted: April 26, 2026 Published: April 30, 2026 Keywords: Creative writing Learning model Literacy approach This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. © 2026 Vidya Karya	In the context of enhancing students' creative story-writing skills, an effective pedagogical model is essential. This study seeks to ascertain (1) the disparity in story-writing proficiency between students utilizing a literacy-approach-based creative writing model and those who do not, and (2) the efficacy of the literacy-approach-based creative writing model. The independent variable in this study is the literacy-approach-based creative writing model, while the dependent variable is the students' story-writing ability. The research was conducted at SDN 13 Biru Watampone, Bone Regency, with the population comprising grade V students. Class VA served as the control group and class VB as the experimental group. Data collection was facilitated through a story-writing test. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality and the Homogeneity of Variance Test were employed to assess normality and homogeneity, respectively, using SPSS 23.0 for Windows. An independent sample t-test, with a 95% confidence level, was conducted to evaluate the differences in story-writing abilities between the control and experimental groups. The gain-score equation was utilized to assess the model's effectiveness. The findings indicate that: (1) there is a significant difference in story-writing ability between students engaged in a literacy approach-based creative writing model and those who are not, and (2) the literacy approach-based creative writing model is highly effective in enhancing students' story-writing proficiency.
To cite this article: Faisal, M., Syamsuddin, A. F., Rahman, A. A., & Sayidiman, S. (2026). The effectiveness of the creative writing learning model based on the literacy approach. <i>Vidya Karya</i>, 41(1), 259-269.	

INTRODUCTION

Indonesian language education, particularly the development of language skills across all educational levels, necessitates significant attention. Specifically, language skills in primary education encompass four key components: (1) listening, (2) speaking, (3) reading, and (4) writing. These skills are interrelated; reading and writing are pivotal in the instruction of the Bahasa Indonesian (Rohmah et al., 2025). Murtadho (2021). Writing is a foundational skill developed across all levels of schooling, supporting students' critical and creative thinking (Al Herz, 2025).

Writing instruction must begin early and be sustained throughout schooling, as foundational writing skills at the primary level underpin later literacy development (Skar et al., 2024). Therefore, developing writing competence in primary school students warrants significant pedagogical attention.

One type of writing that students must master is creative story writing. According to Wang (2019), creative writing is the expression of ideas, feelings, impressions, imagination, and language that a person controls in the form of an essay. The importance of mastering creative writing is based on Morley (2007), who states that creative writing is useful as (a) a means for self-disclosure, (b) a means for understanding, (c) a means to help develop self-satisfaction, pride, and a feeling of self-worth, (d) a means to increase awareness and absorption of one's surroundings, (e) a means for passionate involvement rather than resigned acceptance, and (f) a means to develop an understanding of and ability to use language.

Based on this, Senel and Bağçeci (2019) stated that by writing creative stories, students can express themselves by reflecting on their ideas and opinions. The language skills possessed by students will certainly develop alongside their writing skills (Schnoor & Usanova, 2023). Therefore, creative writing is beneficial for students.

Although the writing skills are among the language skills that play an important role, elementary school students in general are not able to write well, including creative story writing (Aktaş et al., 2021). Consequently, students lack interest in learning to write (Camacho et al., 2020). According to Korth et al., (2017), this is because writing is the most complex activity for students to learn and the most difficult to be taught by teachers, especially in primary schools.

In advanced writing, a writer must be able to simultaneously apply a number of skills. Before writing, the writer needs to make plans, for example, selecting topics, arranging and organizing ideas, and considering the form of writing according to the potential readers. When pouring out ideas, writers must present them in an organized manner. Likewise, the use of linguistic aspects, such as word formation, diction, and sentences, must be arranged effectively. The applications of spelling and punctuation must be precise and functional. Therefore, the demand for a number of skills is proof that writing is complex. This shows that in learning to write, especially creative story writing, a practical and effective model of learning is needed. This multidimensional challenge of writing is well-documented in current research (Kim et al., 2021; Luan et al., 2024).

The learning model that can be employed by teachers to enhance students' interest and ability to write creative stories is the writing learning model based on the literacy approach. Suyono (2009) stated that literacy has a strategic role in schools. The fundamentals of literacy—reading, thinking, and writing—are necessary for students to finish their education, pursue further education, get ready for the workforce, and learn throughout their lives in the community (Dong & Gantulga, 2025). Thus, it makes sense to use literacy as the foundation for creating educational activities in classrooms.

In addition, the literacy approach creates connections between text and context and critically reflects on these connections so that the learning received by students is more meaningful (Corson, 2025). The literacy approach is holistic, integrating reading, writing, and thinking skills. This shows that the literacy approach is in line with the Indonesian language learning approach advocated in the current curriculum, namely, the communicative-integrative approach (Intiana et al., 2023). Kern (2000) asserts that literacy encompasses language use, problem-solving, teamwork, conventions, cultural knowledge, and self-reflection.

Literacy learning in primary schools is crucial for supporting students' academic achievement. Effective literacy learning must consider students' needs, interests, ages, backgrounds, and learning environments. Teachers who are responsive to students' needs, use appropriate teaching strategies, and select teaching materials in accordance with students' backgrounds will have an impact on students' achievement of competencies (Mardiana et al., 2025). List et al. (2020) stated that literacy-based learning is done by developing ideas through developing questions when writing, then developing them

through the connection between ideas and the controversy of each idea. There are benefits to literacy culture-based learning in the classroom since the literacy model aims for students to be able to fully participate actively in applying social and intellectual understanding in addition to being able to comprehend the conceptual meaning of discourse.

Although a culture of literacy (especially reading and writing) is very important for students from an early age, the results of the International Survey Agency Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in the *Programme for International Student Assessment* (PISA) show that the culture of literacy in Indonesia is still very low. The results of the PISA (OECD, 2019, p. 57) on the literacy levels of Indonesian students in 2015 showed that the average literacy skill scores of Indonesian students only increased by one point from 2012 (397), still far below the average score of 72 countries surveyed (493). Indonesia is still below other ASEAN countries such as Singapore (535), Vietnam (487), and Thailand (409) (OECD, 2016). Additionally, Indonesia performed poorly according to the 2018 PISA assessment. Indonesia had a worse score than the average of all participating nations in all three categories. With a score of 371 out of an average of 487, Indonesia came in at number 64.

Indonesia was one of the nations that took part in the OECD PISA evaluation once more in 2022. 37 OECD nations and 44 partner nations made up the 81 participating nations. With a score of 359, Indonesia came in at number 59, a further 12 points below the average global score decline of 18 points (OECD, 2023). Despite the drop in score, Indonesia managed to move up to five places in literacy.

Given the importance of literacy skills, the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) launched the School Literacy Movement in 2016 (Rochmah & Bakar, 2021). In general, the aim of this program is to develop the students' character through the acculturation of the school literacy ecosystem, which is symbolized in the School Literacy Movement, to become lifelong learners (Kartikasari & Nuryasana, 2022). Literacy skills are continuously cultivated in primary, junior, and senior high schools, vocational schools, and special schools. The advancement of technology and media necessitates integrated student literacy skills, emphasizing critical thinking, creativity, communication, and—most importantly—the capacity to use media in a safe manner (Marmuah et al., 2022).

Despite the growing body of literature on literacy education and the recognized urgency of improving writing skills among Indonesian elementary students, a critical research gap remains. Most existing studies on literacy in Indonesian primary schools have focused predominantly on reading comprehension and general literacy program evaluation, such as the School Literacy Movement (Kartikasari & Nuryasana, 2022; Rochmah & Bakar, 2021), while relatively few have investigated the effectiveness of specific instructional models for creative writing at the elementary level. Furthermore, studies that do address writing instruction tend to assess writing outcomes in isolation, without situating instruction within a structured, literacy-based pedagogical framework that integrates the full cycle of reading, thinking, and writing. As a result, there is limited empirical evidence on whether a creative writing learning model explicitly grounded in the literacy approach can produce significant and measurable improvements in students' story-writing ability in Indonesian primary school contexts. This gap is particularly significant given the persistent disconnect between national literacy policy goals and classroom writing instruction practices. Addressing this gap is therefore essential not only for advancing theoretical understanding of literacy-integrated writing pedagogy but also for providing teachers with evidence-based guidance on effective instructional approaches.

For this reason, this study investigates the effectiveness of a creative story-writing learning model based on the literacy approach in primary schools. There are two objectives in this study: (1) to determine whether there is a significant difference in story writing ability between students who take part in learning by using a story creative writing learning

model based on the literacy approach and students who take part in learning without using it and (2) to measure the effectiveness of this model. The novelty of this study lies in its integration of a structured literacy framework (encompassing reading, thinking, and writing) into a quasi-experimental creative writing intervention at the primary school level in Indonesia.

METHODS

This study employed a non-equivalent control group design. A pretest, in which students were assessed before (pretest) and after (posttest) the instructional intervention, was the final test after treatment. The independent variable in this study was the learning model for creative story writing based on the literacy approach, while the ability to write stories was the dependent variable. This research was conducted at the SDN 13 Biru Watampone Bone Regency. The population in this study was fifth-grade students of SDN 13 Biru Watampone, with samples of class VA as the control class and class VB as the experimental class.

Classes VA and VB were selected as the control and experimental groups, respectively, because they were the only two intact fifth-grade classes available at the school at the time of the study. Both classes had comparable enrollment sizes (25 students each) and were taught by teachers with similar instructional experience, making them suitable for comparison. The selection of these classes was made with the approval of the school principal and was consistent with the non-equivalent control group design employed, in which pre-existing class groupings are utilized rather than random assignment of individual students (Creswell, 2012).

Data were collected through a story-writing test administered to both the experimental and control classes in two phases. Both phases consisted of *pretest* and *posttest*. The research instrument used in this study was a test tool in the form of story-writing questions. The results of the students' story writing were assessed based on the results of the adaptation and adjustment of the assessment according to Nurgiyantoro (2010). The assessment of writing stories is emphasized in terms of content, organization and presentation, language, and mechanics. To be more relevant, the assessment aspects are further divided according to the following criteria: (1) the content aspect includes the suitability of the story content with the theme and the creativity of story development; (2) the presentation organization aspect includes the presentation of short story facts (character description, plot, and setting), the presentation of story means (title, point of view, and style), the cohesiveness of story elements, and the logicity of the story sequence; (3) the language aspect includes language style and sentence construction; and (4) the mechanical aspects include paragraph cohesiveness and spelling and punctuation.

To ensure the validity of the instrument, the story-writing test was reviewed by expert validators in the field of Indonesian language education, who assessed the suitability of the test items against the established learning objectives and assessment criteria. Based on expert judgment, the instrument was declared valid for use. The reliability of the instrument was assessed through inter-rater reliability testing, in which trained raters independently scored a sample of student writing using the Nurgiyantoro (2010) assessment rubric. The inter-rater reliability coefficient exceeded the acceptable threshold, indicating high reliability (Creswell, 2012).

The results of the data *normality* test using the *Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality* with the help of SPSS 23.0 *for Windows* found that all *pretest* data for each class had exceeded the required level of significance value (α) (5% or 0.05). The results indicate that all pretest data were normally distributed. Furthermore, based on the *Test of Homogeneity of Variance*, the significance value (p = based on mean) was 0.439, greater than the significance value required in the testing criteria ($0.439 > 0.05$). These results

indicate that the variance of the pretest data across the experimental and control classes was homogeneous.

To determine the difference in story-writing ability between the control and experimental class students, an independent sample t-test was conducted with a confidence level of 5% or less. To determine the effectiveness of the learning model, the difference in the average score of the story writing results of the experimental and control class students was determined, and the gain score was calculated.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following section presents the findings based on pre-test and post-test analyses for the control and experimental groups of Grade V students at SDN 13 Biru Watampone.

Differences in Story Writing Ability of Control and Experimental Class Students

The data in this study include *pre-test* and *post-test* data on story-writing skills in the control and experimental classes. The *pre- and post-test* data were obtained from the story-writing test scores. The results of the research on the experimental and control classes are as follows in Table 1.

Table 1 Summary of percentage levels of story writing ability of control class and experimental classes

Experiment Class				Ability Level	Qualification	Control Class			
Pretest		Posttest				Pretest		Posttest	
F	%	F	%			F	%	F	%
0	0	13	52	80 and above	Very good	0	0	3	12
1	4	9	36	70-79	Good	1	4	5	20
3	12	2	8	60-69	Medium	2	8	6	24
2	8	0	0	50-59	Low	2	8	7	28
19	76	1	1	49 and below	Very Low	20	80	4	16
25	100	25	100			25	100	25	100

Table 1 showed that the *posttest* results of both the experimental and control classes showed an increase in the ability to write better stories compared to the students' previous abilities (*post-test* results). The experimental class students' *post-test* results showed better improvement in their story-writing ability. The *pre-test* results showed that the very low qualification had the highest percentage (76%), but the post-test results showed that the qualification of students' writing skills had improved, as many as 52% of students achieved very good qualifications, and the remaining 1% of students qualified as very low. As for the control class, the post-test results showed that the percentage of students with very low qualifications was still high (16%), and only 12% of students achieved very good qualifications.

In addition, there was a difference in the average difference in scores from *pre-test* to *post-test* between the experimental and control groups. The difference in the average scores of the experimental group was greater than that of the control group. The average *post-test* score of the control class was 62.9, while the average score of the experimental class was 80.3. The difference in these numbers proves the difference in the results achieved by students at the time of the *post-test*.

The difference in the ability to write stories in the control class and experimental classes is even clearer after the independent sample t-test. Based on the test results, it is known that the t-count value ($-4.722 < t\text{-table } (-1.677)$). Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in story writing ability between students who take part in learning using a story-based creative writing learning model and students who take part in learning without using a literacy-approach-based writing learning model.

Level of Effectiveness of Creative Writing Learning Model Based on Literacy Approach

The level of effectiveness of using the creative writing learning model based on the literacy approach can be seen based on the difference in the *gain score* of students' story writing results in the control and experimental classes, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Gain score of story writing test results of control class and experimental class students

Experiment Class (25 samples)		Total 50 Sample	Control Class (25 samples)	
<i>Pretest</i>	<i>Posttest</i>	Test Type	<i>Pretest</i>	<i>Posttest</i>
863.65	2009.07	Total Score	900.00	1572.74
34.54	80.36	Average	36.00	62.90
16.17		Gain Score	9.10	
0.64		Average Gain Score	0.36	

Table 2 shows that the average pre-test scores from experimental and control groups were relatively similar. However, the results of students' *post-test* scores showed that the experimental class had a better level of story-writing ability than the control class. When viewed from the results of the *gain score*, the experimental class's average *gain score* is 0.64, and the control class's *gain score* is 0.36. Referring to the categorization of the *gain score* value determined in the research method, the *gain score* values of the experimental and control classes are in the medium category. However, when viewed from the difference in the *gain score* value of the experimental and control classes, it is 7.07 (obtained from $16.17 - 9.10 = 7.07$).

The *gain score* difference is positive, which means that the improvement in the creative writing results of experimental class students is much better than the improvement in the creative writing results of control class students. Thus, it can be concluded that the creative story writing learning model based on the literacy approach is very effective in improving the story-writing ability of grade V students of SDN 13 Biru Watampone.

In this study, the findings indicate a significant difference in story-writing ability between the experimental and control groups. Furthermore, the literacy approach-based model demonstrated effectiveness in improving students' story-writing ability among Grade V students at SDN 13 Biru Watampone.

One contributing factor to students' limited story-writing ability is the prevailing use of product-oriented writing instruction. Without grounding in a structured writing process, students are unlikely to develop the iterative composition skills they need. This is consistent with findings that students generally lack interest and motivation to write and that writing is among the most cognitively demanding skills to develop (Camacho et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2021).

Unlike the learning model for creative writing based on the literacy approach, learning to write is accomplished through a series of activity processes or stages. In accordance with the characteristics of the literacy approach proposed by Kern (2015), namely (a) *responding*, (b) *revision*, and (c) *reflecting*, writing should be treated as a process rather than a "one-off" activity. Related to Kern's opinion, Kim et al. (2021) and Ryan et al., (2021) state that there are three main stages in the writing process: (a) prewriting, (b) writing, and (c) post-writing. In line with this opinion, Kurniawan (2014) divides the stages of creative writing (especially writing children's stories) into (a) preparation, (b) presentation, (c) *practice*, and (d) *performance*.

Therefore, Bull (1989) suggested that the writing process should be treated as a series of circular activities. This recursive conception of writing aligns with more recent process-writing scholarship (Kim et al., 2021). If so, the writing activity does not stop when a draft has been published. A published draft can be used as a new stimulus in the next stage of

writing. Of course, there will be an increase in quality.

Creative story writing learning that is not based on the literacy approach, in addition to writing learning being done "once and for all," also tends to have the following: (a) the selection of writing learning materials is solely based on the teacher's book or student's book; teachers make less use of media or other learning resources; (b) learning management is done classically. (c) Writing activities are always done individually. Such product-oriented, isolated writing instruction has been associated with student boredom, lack of motivation, and persistently poor writing outcomes (Ulu, 2019; Luan et al., 2024).

This will certainly make it difficult to develop students' writing skills. Learning materials or materials that are always based on student books or textbooks cause boredom in students (Ulu, 2019). Students write without motivation because the topics contained in the Student Book are not necessarily in accordance with the wishes or ideas of students (Luan et al., 2024). In addition to the Student Book, teachers should be able to utilize other materials or sources that can be used as sources of ideas for students. Related to this, Kurniawan (2014) stated that students' first difficulty in writing is a problem or idea that will be discussed in writing. The reality that often occurs in learning: (1) every time there is a story-writing lesson, students are anxious and confused about what to write a story about; (2) if the problem to be told has been determined, students are also confused about developing the story problem; and (3) the confusion makes students feel that writing stories is a subject matter that is more difficult than other subjects.

For this reason, Kurniawan (2014) suggested that before learning to write begins, the initial preparation that teachers need to do is to deepen the material and theme that will be the focus of writing. The materials chosen must (1) be in accordance with the learning materials and themes, (2) be in accordance with the context of students' experiences, and (3) be in accordance with the problems that students often face today.

The organization of learning activities to write creative stories based on the literacy approach, in addition to providing individual learning opportunities, also provides opportunities to learn to write collaboratively. Through collaborative writing learning activities, students are given the opportunity to exchange experiences and thoughts with their peers, work cooperatively in writing groups, conduct class discussions, and ask questions and receive answers from the teacher. In other words, writing-learning activities that emphasize interactive patterns are required. The interaction in question is teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction, both in small groups and in large groups/classes. Afrezah et al., (2024) and Chen and Yu (2019) state that collaborative writing activities in the classroom can provide opportunities for students to discuss or engage in other activities that can help the effectiveness of the writing process. Wigglesworth and Storch (2012) further assert that writers can ask for opinions from other people when students are writing, where classmates and teachers can provide suggestions, and collaborative writing tasks in the classroom can provide opportunities for students to discuss so that students who write can get suggestions to improve their writing.

Collaborative writing activities provide opportunities for students to discuss or *brainstorm*, making it possible for new ideas to emerge about what to write and how to write. Shirvani and Porkar (2021); Unin and Bearing (2016) mentioned that *brainstorming* is an appropriate way to prepare lessons, especially lessons on reading texts, discussion, and writing on specific topics. In this way, students are actively involved in determining the theme, coming up with appropriate ideas, and generalizing from the ideas that appear. In addition, Unin and Bearing (2016) assert that brainstorming can provide students an opportunity to express and formulate their opinions about certain problems or topics. Learning is initiated by the teacher by stating a problem to the class, then students try to answer, give opinions, or comments. Hence, it is possible to develop a new problem as a way to obtain ideas from a group of people in a relatively short time.

Through *brainstorming* in writing, students become more creative and active in developing concepts, ideas, or even facts relevant to the topic. Interactively, students discuss, converse, and listen critically to receive input from others (peers or teachers) (Shirvani & Porkar, 2021). Such learning is the profile of a creative story-writing learning model that is based on the literacy approach.

In sum, a literacy approach-based creative writing model offers a more structured, meaningful, and process-oriented learning experience than conventional writing instruction, as empirically demonstrated by this study (Dong & Gantulga, 2025; Corson, 2025). For this reason, the literacy approach-based creative writing model is more effective in improving students' story-writing ability than conventional instruction that does not employ a structured literacy framework.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions can be drawn. First, there is a significant difference in the ability to write stories between students who take part in learning using a story-based creative writing learning model and students who take part in writing learning without using a story-based creative writing learning model, based on the literacy approach in grade V students of SDN 13 Biru Watampone. Second, the creative story-writing learning model based on the literacy approach is effective in learning to write stories for Grade V students of SDN 13 Biru Watampone. The difference in gain score was positive, indicating that the literacy approach-based model produced meaningfully greater gains in story-writing ability than conventional instruction.

Despite these promising findings, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the study was conducted at a single school (SDN 13 Biru Watampone) with a relatively small sample of 50 students, which limits the generalisability of the findings to broader populations. Second, the non-equivalent control group design, while appropriate for this school context, does not allow for full randomization, and pre-existing differences between classes cannot be entirely ruled out. Third, the study did not include long-term follow-up measures to assess the durability of the learning gains over time. These findings carry important theoretical and practical implications.

Theoretically, the study contributes to the growing body of evidence supporting process-based and literacy-integrated approaches to writing instruction in primary education. Practically, the results suggest that teachers and school administrators should consider adopting literacy approach-based creative writing models as a structured pedagogical alternative to conventional “one-off” writing activities. Teacher professional development programs should incorporate training in this model to scale its implementation across schools in Indonesia and other similar educational contexts.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

Conceptualization, MF and AFS; methodology design and development, AAR; formal analysis and data interpretation, S; writing—original draft preparation, MF and AFS; review and editing, AAR and S; supervision and project administration, MF; all authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

AI DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author used ChatGPT during the preparation of this work to check coherence and grammatical errors. After using the tool/service, the author thoroughly reviewed and edited the content as needed and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication. The

authors declare that this research was prepared, researched, written, and edited without the aid of artificial intelligence (AI) techniques.

REFERENCES

- Afrezah, N. N., Azizi, M. R., Alrian, R., Pratiwi, D., & Yulia, Y. (2024). Students' writing skills through collaborative writing and the tendency to work in a group. *Journal of Research in Instructional*. <https://doi.org/10.30862/jri.v4i1.318>
- Aktaş, N., Yıldız, M., & Gökmen, A. D. Y. (2021). Investigation of story writing skills in elementary school students (4th-8th grades). *International Journal of Progressive Education*. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.375.17>
- Al Herz, J. (2025). Developing critical thinking skills through English writing assignments at King Faisal University. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(8), 350-350. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n8p350>
- Bull, G. (1989). *Reflective teaching: Using process and thinking as content*. Australian Reading Association.
- Camacho, A., Alves, R., & Boscolo, P. (2020). Writing motivation in school: A systematic review of empirical research in the early twenty-first century. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 213-247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09530-4>
- Chen, W., & Yu, S. (2019). Implementing collaborative writing in teacher-centered classroom contexts: student beliefs and perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 28, 247-267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1675680>
- Corson, L. (2025). The importance of a critical literacy framework: Though texts may be banned, students' questions and inquiry are not. *The Reading Teacher*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.70009>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Dong, L., & Gantulga, U. (2025). Developing the integrated reading and writing skills of elementary school students. *International Journal of Social Science and Economics Invention*. <https://doi.org/10.23958/ijssci/vol11-i6/399>
- Intiana, S. R. H., Prihartini, A. A., Handayani, F., Mar'i, M., & Faridi, K. (2023). Independent curriculum and the Indonesian language education throughout the era of society 5.0: A literature review. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i1.3140>
- Kartikasari, E., & Nuryasana, E. (2022). School literacy movement program in elementary school, Indonesia: Literature review. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 16(3), 336-341. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v16i3.20383>
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Kern, R. (2015). *Language, literacy, and technology*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9781139567701>
- Kim, Y. S. G., Yang, D., Reyes, M., & Connor, C. (2021). Writing instruction improves students' writing skills differentially depending on focal instruction and children: A meta-analysis for primary grade students. *Educational Research Review*, 34, 100408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100408>
- Korth, B., Wimmer, J., Wilcox, B., Morrison, T., Harward, S., Peterson, N., Simmerman, S., & Pierce, L. (2017). Practices and challenges of writing instruction in k-2 classrooms: a case study of five primary grade teachers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 45, 237-249. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-016-0774-1>
- Kurniawan, H. (2014). *Pembelajaran menulis kreatif: Berbasis komunikatif dan apresiatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

- List, A., Du, H., & Lee, H. Y. (2020). Examining relation formation across consistent and conflicting texts. *Discourse Processes*, 58, 134-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853x.2020.1834328>
- Luan, N. M., Rajendran, M., Subramanian, J., Jaisankar, D., Oli, L., & A, P. (2024). Exploration of factors causing difficulties in students' writing skills. *World Journal of English Language*. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n4p447>
- Mardiana, Roslennv, & Azis, M. (2025). Teacher competence and student learning outcomes: A correlational study in primary education. *Journal of Literacy Education*. <https://doi.org/10.64780/jole.v1i3.88>
- Marmuah, S., Poerwanti, J., & Suharno. (2022). Literacy culture management of elementary school in indonesia. *Heliyon*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09315>
- Morley, D. (2007). *The Cambridge introduction to creative writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Murtadho, F. (2021). Metacognitive and critical thinking practices in developing EFL students' argumentative writing skills. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31752>
- Nurdiyantoro, B. (2010). *Penilaian pembelajaran sastra berbasis kompetensi*. Yogyakarta: BPFe.
- OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I): What Students Know and Can Do*. O. Publishing.
- OECD. (2023). *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education*. O. Publishing.
- Rochmah, Z., & Bakar, M. (2021). Studi kebijakan mengenai gerakan literasi sekolah. *Asatiza*, 2(2), 110-115. <https://doi.org/10.46963/asatiza.v2i2.288>
- Rohmah, I. H., Rismawati, R., & Julianto, I. R. (2025). Strategi guru sekolah dasar pada pembelajaran bahasa indonesia berbantuan teknologi. *Jurnal Cahaya Edukasi*. <https://doi.org/10.63863/jce.v3i1.20>
- Ryan, M., Khosronejad, M., Barton, G., Kervin, L., & Myhill, D. (2021). A reflexive approach to teaching writing: Enablements and constraints in primary school classrooms. *Written Communication*, 38(3), 417-446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883211005558>
- Schnoor, B., & Usanova, I. (2023). Multilingual writing development: Relationships between writing proficiencies in German, heritage language and English. *Reading and Writing*, 36(3), 599-623. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-022-10276-4>
- Senel, M., & Bagçeci, B. (2019). Development of creative thinking skills of students through journal writing. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 15(5), 216-237.
- Shirvani, M., & Porkar, R. (2021). How do efl students perceive brainstorming in l2 writing classes? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1112.12>
- Skar, G. B., Graham, S., Huebner, A., Kvistad, A. H., Johansen, M. B., & Aasen, A. J. (2024). A longitudinal intervention study of the effects of increasing amount of meaningful writing across grades 1 and 2. *Reading and Writing*, 37(6), 1345-1373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10460-0>
- Suyono, S. (2009). Pembelajaran efektif dan produktif berbasis literasi: Analisis konteks, prinsip, dan wujud alternatif strategi implementasinya di sekolah. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Seni*, 37(2), 203-218.
- Ulu, H. (2019). Investigation of fourth grade primary school students' creative writing and story elements in narrative text writing skills. *International Journal of Progressive Education*. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2019.212.18>

- Unin, N., & Bearing, P. (2016). Brainstorming as a way to approach student-centered learning in the esl classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 224, 605-612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.450>
- Wang, L. (2019). Rethinking the significance of creative writing: A neglected art form behind the language learning curriculum. <https://doi.org/10.17863/cam.46573>
- Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2012). What role for collaboration in writing and writing feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 364-374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.005>

AUTHOR PROFILES



Muh. Faisal
muh.faisal@unm.ac.id
Indonesian Language Literacy
Department of Elementary School Teacher Education
https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=e4R_OMkAAAAJ
Sinta ID : 6035181



Afdhal Fatawuri Syamsuddin
Teacher Education and Development
Department of Elementary School Teacher Education
<https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=8D8t1tQAAAAJ>
Sinta ID : 6809743
Publon ID: 696116



Ahmad Ardillah Rahman
Digital Learning and Technology in Education
Department of Elementary School Teacher Education
<https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=eh8oGYAAAAAJ>
Sinta ID : 6688578
Scopus ID: 57209465644



Sayidiman
Self-regulated learning
Department of Elementary School Teacher Education
<https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=aUPU9scAAAAJ>
Sinta ID : 5973905
Scopus ID: 57202604419