Academic Journal Research
Homepage : https://journal.antispublisher.com/index.php/acjoure
Email : admin@antispublisher.com

e-ISSN : 3026-3085
ACJOURE, Vol. 4, No. 2, December 2026
Page 32-44

Indonesian Language Teaching Material Design Skills of Junior High School Teachers in East Lombok within the Deep Learning Paradigm

Ahsanul Aini[1], Khirjan Nahdi[2], Roni Amrulloh[3]
[123]Hamzanwadi University, Indonesia

DOI : https://doi.org/10.61796/acjoure.v4i2.540

Sections Info

Article history:
Submitted: April 20, 2026
Final Revised: May 05, 2026
Accepted: June 18, 2026
Published: July 20, 2026

Keywords:
Deep learning
Teaching material design
Indonesian language
Junior high school teachers
Mixed methods

ABSTRACT

Objective: *This study aims to describe the skills of Indonesian language teachers at the junior high school and Islamic junior high school levels in East Lombok in designing teaching materials aligned with the deep learning paradigm. Deep learning encompasses the dimensions of learning principles – meaningful, mindful, and joyful – pedagogical frameworks, reading literacy, verbal communication, learning cycles, and twenty-first-century competencies.* ***Method:*** *Research data were triangulated through three primary sources: questionnaires completed by 22 teachers, individual interviews, and a review of 17 teaching module documents. The data were analyzed using a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design to reveal the gap between teachers' self-perceptions and their actual implementation in instructional documents. The research method combined Likert-scale score analysis and qualitative thematic analysis based on an interactive model.* ***Results:*** *The results showed an average questionnaire score of 4.04, categorized as Good. The Deep Learning Principles dimension obtained the highest score of 4.20, although its implementation was the most uneven according to the document analysis. Interview data revealed a readiness gap between teachers who had and had not participated in formal training. The document review showed that critical literary literacy was absent from most modules, while digital integration remained consumptive. Teachers' teaching-material design skills were perceived as good, but their implementation was constrained by conceptual gaps and institutional structural factors, particularly the policies of pesantren-based schools.* ***Novelty:*** *The urgency of this study lies in the gap between curriculum policies promoting deep learning and the limited empirical evidence regarding the readiness of language teachers in rural-coastal areas to translate these principles into concrete teaching modules, particularly in pesantren-based schools with structural limitations.*

INTRODUCTION

The current Primary and Secondary Education Curriculum in Indonesia encourages the implementation of the deep learning paradigm as a learning framework that emphasizes meaningfulness, awareness, and enjoyment in learning (*mindful, meaningful, and joyful learning*) as an inseparable unity [1], [2], [3]. The Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education [4] formulated three pillars of deep learning toward quality education. This paradigm requires changes in classroom teaching strategies and fundamental transformations in pedagogical practices, particularly in the design of teaching materials. Teaching materials are documents that reflect the extent to which teachers translate curricular ideas into implementable learning plans. A gap between curricular design and classroom instructional reality may occur when curriculum changes take place too rapidly and exceed teachers' capacities. This gap becomes increasingly complex when associated with the Indonesian language subject, which has disciplinary characteristics that differ from those of the exact sciences. Indonesian

language learning requires the integration of language competencies, critical literacy, and literary appreciation as a means of developing students' literacy awareness and character [5]. All these elements must be designed to be contextually meaningful, encourage students' reflective awareness, and remain enjoyable, in accordance with the demand to develop students' competency profiles as critical, creative, and collaborative thinkers [6]. Deep learning principles relevant to Indonesian language learning include connecting learning materials with students' real-life experiences, establishing learning partnerships beyond classroom boundaries, using the environment and digital technology productively, strengthening multilevel reading literacy up to evaluative and reflective levels, reinforcing structured verbal communication, and developing twenty-first-century competencies involving critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication (4C), including higher-order thinking skills in analysing, evaluating, and creating [7]. These six principles should ideally be incorporated comprehensively into an integrated teaching material design rather than merely being mentioned normatively in the module identity section.

Most studies on deep learning in Indonesian language education remain limited to conceptual discussions or literature reviews that examine deep learning strategies and effectiveness based on national and international literature without providing empirical evidence from teachers' instructional documents in actual educational settings [8]. Development studies focusing on the production of textbooks or teaching materials have been conducted by Salamah and Rokhyanto, while studies on improving teacher capacity through training programmes have been conducted by Jumadi et al [9], [10]. Neither study independently analysed teachers' skills in designing teaching materials apart from the interventions provided. Other studies examining the effectiveness of deep learning-based Indonesian language instructional designs in improving reading literacy have shown promising results at the primary education level [11]. However, evidence at the junior high school level, particularly regarding teachers' skills in designing teaching materials, remains limited. Addressing this gap has become increasingly urgent because implementing the deep learning paradigm requires teachers' readiness at the technical design level, rather than merely a philosophical understanding.

East Lombok was selected as the research context because it represents heterogeneous junior high school conditions, ranging from public schools in district urban areas and private pesantren-based schools to Islamic junior high schools with limited digital infrastructure. This context is important because teachers' skills in designing deep learning-based teaching materials cannot be separated from the structural environment in which they work. Institutional policies, such as prohibitions on the use of digital devices in several pesantren-based schools, become determining variables that restrict teachers' opportunities to integrate digital dimensions into teaching material design, regardless of their pedagogical competence. This condition is consistent with findings from comparative education literature indicating that the quality of student-centred learning is influenced by institutional contexts, school policies, and

teachers' individual competencies [12]. Therefore, research on teaching material design skills not only measures teachers' individual competencies but also positions these competencies within their interaction with the institutional context.

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design that combined three types of data sequentially and complementarily: questionnaire data as evidence of teachers' self-perceptions, interview data as explanations of the patterns and reasons underlying those perceptions, and teaching module document review data as objective evidence of what teachers had actually designed. These three data sources enabled the researchers to assess teachers' capacity to evaluate themselves and examine the consistency between their self-assessments and the instructional documents they produced. Such a triangulation approach has rarely been comprehensively applied in studies of deep learning in Indonesian language education at the junior high school level, which have generally relied on only one type of data, either teacher perceptions obtained through questionnaires or conceptual literature reviews.

This study aims to describe and analyse the skills of Indonesian language teachers at junior high schools and Islamic junior high schools in East Lombok in designing teaching materials aligned with the deep learning paradigm by examining the consistency among teachers' self-perceptions, qualitative explanations of those perceptions, and concrete evidence contained in the teaching module documents they prepared. The study focuses on six dimensions of skills: deep learning principles, learning frameworks, reading literacy, verbal communication, the learning-stage cycle, and twenty-first-century competencies. It also considers the role of contextual and institutional factors as variables that determine the upper limits of the quality of teaching materials that teachers can design and implement in actual educational settings. Teachers' mastery of instructional design is a fundamental prerequisite for achieving meaningful and transformative learning processes [6]. Therefore, evidence of these skills can serve as a basis for formulating future teacher professional development programmes.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a mixed-methods approach with a sequential explanatory design, in which quantitative data collection and analysis were conducted first, followed by qualitative data collection and analysis to explain and deepen the quantitative findings [13]. This design was selected because the study sought not only to measure teachers' skill levels numerically but also to understand the meanings, contexts, and reasons underlying the numerical results. Therefore, the qualitative phase was positioned as an explanatory stage for the patterns emerging from the quantitative phase rather than as an independent source of data.

The research participants were 22 Indonesian language teachers at the junior high school and Islamic junior high school levels in East Lombok, representing eleven educational institutions: SMPN 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 Masbagik; SMPIT Raudatul Mujahidin

Kumbung; SMP Islam NW Kumbung; SMP Yadinu; MTs Tarbiyatul Muslimin; MTs Yadinu; and MTs Raudatul Azhar. The participants were selected purposively by considering the representation of different types of educational institutions, including public schools, general private schools, and pesantren-based Islamic schools. This selection was intended to adequately capture variations in the institutional contexts influencing teaching material design practices rather than merely variations in teachers' individual competencies.

Data were collected sequentially using three complementary instruments. First, a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire, ranging from 1 = Very Poor to 5 = Very Good, consisted of 15 statement items developed based on six dimensions of teaching material design skills within the deep learning paradigm. These dimensions included Dimension A, Deep Learning Principles, comprising meaningful, mindful, and joyful learning; Dimension B, Learning Framework, comprising pedagogical practices, learning partnerships, learning environments, and digital technology use; Dimension C, Reading Literacy, comprising functional literacy and critical literary literacy; Dimension D, Verbal Communication; Dimension E, the Deep Learning Stage Cycle and structured reflection; and Dimension F, Twenty-First-Century Competencies or the 4Cs. The questionnaire items were developed based on the theoretical review presented in the previous chapter, and their content suitability was examined through discussions with the academic supervisor before the questionnaire was administered offline to all 22 respondents.

Second, individual semi-structured interviews were conducted from 11 to 18 May 2026 with the same 22 respondents who completed the questionnaire. The interviews used three main questions included in the interview guidelines, concerning teachers' conceptual readiness to design teaching materials based on deep learning, the actual implementation of these principles in the classroom, and the challenges encountered during the process. The interviews were conducted face-to-face at each educational institution, recorded with the respondents' permission, and transcribed verbatim before analysis. Interviews were selected as the second instrument to explain the questionnaire score patterns, which tended to be relatively uniform within the Good category, by identifying qualitative variations that could not be captured through the scale-based instrument.

Third, a document review was conducted on teaching modules independently prepared by the teachers. Of the 22 respondents, 17 submitted their teaching modules for analysis. The remaining five respondents did not submit documents because their modules had not yet been completed or had been prepared collectively with other teachers and therefore could not be attributed to them individually. The document review functioned as a verification instrument by comparing teachers' self-perception claims in the questionnaires and interviews with concrete evidence in the instructional documents they had actually produced.

Quantitative data analysis was conducted by calculating total scores and mean scores at three levels: individual items, dimensions, and all respondents. The mean scores

were then classified into five categories based on class intervals: Very Poor, ranging from 1.00 to 1.79; Poor, from 1.80 to 2.59; Fair, from 2.60 to 3.39; Good, from 3.40 to 4.19; and Very Good, from 4.20 to 5.00. This classification followed the Likert-scale conversion commonly used in educational research. Qualitative interview data were analysed using the interactive model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), which involved three cyclical stages: data condensation, by summarising and focusing the interview transcripts according to the three question areas; data display, by organising the summaries into a comparative matrix across respondents; and conclusion drawing and verification, by identifying recurring patterns and exceptions within the matrix [14].

Through this process, the 22 respondents were grouped into four clusters based on a combination of two variables: their history of formal training related to deep learning and the level of alignment demonstrated in the teaching modules they produced. Cluster 1 consisted of teachers who had received training and demonstrated a high level of alignment. Cluster 2 consisted of teachers who had not received training but had undertaken independent initiatives and demonstrated a moderate level of alignment. Cluster 3 consisted of teachers who had not received training and demonstrated a low level of alignment. Cluster 4 consisted of teachers who had received training but faced structural barriers that limited implementation.

The teaching module documents were analysed by matching each module component against 15 indicators aligned with the questionnaire items. Each indicator was then classified into one of three availability statuses: Present, when the component was fully and explicitly fulfilled in the planned activities; Partially Present, when the component was mentioned but not operationally implemented in the activity procedures; and Absent, when the component was not found in either the module identity section or the learning activities. The matching process involved examining all sections of the modules, including their identity, learning objectives, activity procedures, and assessment instruments, to ensure that the assigned availability status reflected actual implementation rather than the mere presence of terminology in the documents.

The results of the three analyses were subsequently triangulated to answer the research questions comprehensively. The quantitative questionnaire data were used to map the general patterns of teachers' self-perceptions at the population level. The interview data were used to explain the reasons, contexts, and individual variations underlying these patterns and to provide the basis for cluster formation. The document data were used to verify the consistency between what teachers perceived and stated and what they had actually designed in their teaching materials. Inconsistencies among the three data sources in particular components, as presented in the findings section, formed the basis for interpreting the gap between teachers' conceptual understanding and their operational ability to design teaching materials based on the deep learning paradigm.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The total scores of the 22 respondents ranged from 42 to 74 out of a maximum score of 75, with an overall mean score of 60.55. The lowest score was obtained by a respondent from MTs Yadinu, while the highest score was achieved by three respondents from SMPIT Raudatul Mujahidin Kumbung, SMPN 5 Masbagik, and MTs Raudatul Azhar.

At the item level, of the 15 statements presented, three items were classified as Very Good: Mindful Learning (4.23), Joyful Learning (4.23), and Learning Partnerships (4.27). The remaining 12 items were classified as Good, with mean scores ranging from 3.82 to 4.14. None of the items fell into the Fair category or below.

At the dimensional level, all six dimensions were classified as Good. The mean scores, ranked from highest to lowest, were as follows: Dimension A/Deep Learning Principles (4.20), Dimension B/Learning Framework (4.08), Dimension C/Reading Literacy (4.02), Dimension E/Deep Learning Stage Cycle (3.97), Dimension D/Verbal Communication (3.93), and Dimension F/Twenty-First-Century Competencies (3.82). The overall mean score across the 15 items was 4.04, which was classified as Good. The difference between the highest- and lowest-scoring dimensions was 0.38 points.

Interviews with the same 22 questionnaire respondents were conducted from 11 to 18 May 2026. The interviews addressed three main aspects: readiness to design teaching materials, classroom implementation, and the challenges encountered. Based on data condensation and display using the interactive model, the respondents were grouped into four clusters according to their formal training backgrounds and the degree of alignment demonstrated in the teaching modules they produced.

Cluster 1 consisted of teachers who had participated in formal training related to deep learning and produced highly aligned teaching modules. Teachers in this cluster came from SMPN 6 Masbagik and SMPIT Raudatul Mujahidin Kumbung. They were able to explain the relationships among deep learning principles systematically and explicitly recognised that teaching material design should begin with students' real-life experiences rather than merely with the prescribed learning outcomes.

Cluster 2 included teachers who had not participated in formal training but demonstrated independent learning initiatives, such as participating in subject-teacher forums or independently exploring online learning resources. These teachers produced modules with a moderate level of alignment. Their conceptual understanding was generally accurate, although it was not consistently translated into operational learning activities.

Cluster 3 consisted of teachers who had neither participated in formal training nor demonstrated significant independent learning initiatives. Consequently, they produced modules with a low level of alignment. Several teachers in this cluster, including those from MTs Tarbiyatul Muslimin, SMPN 2 Masbagik, and MTs Yadinu, explicitly

acknowledged that their instructional practices were still dominated by lectures and had not operationally incorporated deep learning principles.

Cluster 4 consisted of teachers who had participated in formal training but encountered structural barriers that limited implementation. This cluster was particularly prevalent in pesantren-based schools, where teachers conceptually understood what should be incorporated into teaching material design but were unable to implement it fully because of institutional policies.

The most dominant and consistently reported barriers across the clusters were limited access to technology, unstable internet connections, and inadequate facilities supporting digital learning. In several pesantren-based schools, including MTs Yadinu, SMP Yadinu, and MTs Raudatul Azhar, these challenges were compounded by institutional policies restricting students' use of digital devices.

Teachers in these schools, most of whom belonged to Cluster 4, stated that the limited digital integration in their teaching material designs was not caused by insufficient competence but by structural institutional conditions beyond their control. In contrast, teachers from SMPN 6 Masbagik and SMPIT Raudatul Mujahidin Kumbung, who did not face similar restrictions, demonstrated more varied and extensive forms of digital integration.

The review of the 17 teaching module documents produced findings that both reinforced and modified the patterns identified in the questionnaire and interview data.

Regarding the meaningful learning component, 12 of the 17 modules were classified as Present, while five were classified as Partially Present. Almost all teachers began their learning activities with stimulating questions related to students' real-life experiences.

The joyful learning component appeared in various forms, ranging from rapid-response games to vlog projects and group competitions. It was classified as Present in seven modules, Partially Present in eight modules, and Absent in two modules.

For the mindful learning component, 12 modules were classified as Present. However, three modules did not explicitly include mindful activities, such as breathing techniques, contemplative questions, or structured metacognitive activities.

In Dimension B, constructivist pedagogical practices, including Discovery Learning, Inquiry Learning, and Project-Based Learning, were classified as Present in 13 modules. These practices were particularly evident in the modules prepared by Cluster 1 teachers, who consistently applied the selected learning models from the module identity section through to the main learning activities.

Several modules prepared by teachers in Clusters 2 and 3 showed inconsistencies between the learning models specified in the module identity sections and the main learning activities. For example, some modules identified Project-Based Learning as the selected model, although the main activities remained teacher-directed and receptive.

Although learning partnerships obtained the highest questionnaire score of 4.27, the modules generally represented partnerships only as interactions among students

within the classroom. Partnerships extending beyond classroom boundaries and involving parents, community members, or external resource persons were explicitly identified in only two modules, both of which were produced by Cluster 1 teachers.

The digital technology use component was most frequently classified as Partially Present, accounting for 10 of the 17 modules. Most modules used digital technology for consumptive activities, such as watching videos or accessing online dictionaries. Only two modules positioned students as digital content producers through podcast and vlog projects. Both modules were produced in schools without restrictions on digital-device use.

In Dimension C, critical literary literacy was classified as Absent in 12 modules, Partially Present in three modules, and Present in only two modules. Most modules focused on nonfiction texts, including observation reports, exposition, explanation, description, and news texts. Reading activities in most modules reached only the comprehension and interpretation levels and rarely extended to critical evaluation or personal reflection.

In Dimensions D and E, structured verbal communication rubrics were classified as Absent in eight modules. By contrast, the deep learning stage cycle and structured reflection components were relatively well represented, being classified as Present in 13 and 11 modules, respectively.

In Dimension F, the twenty-first-century competency component was classified as Present in eight modules and Partially Present in another eight modules. Only one module was classified as Absent in this component.

Discussion

The questionnaire results initially indicate that teachers had relatively high confidence in their ability to design teaching materials based on the deep learning paradigm. None of the 15 questionnaire items were classified as Fair or below, and the overall mean score of 4.04 placed teachers' self-perceived skills within the Good category. Teachers reported the greatest confidence in philosophical and experiential aspects of learning, particularly meaningful, mindful, and joyful learning, as well as learning partnerships.

However, their relatively lower confidence in verbal communication and twenty-first-century competencies indicates that operational aspects requiring structured instruments were perceived as more challenging. These aspects include the preparation of verbal communication assessment rubrics and the systematic integration of critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication. Nevertheless, because the numerical difference between the highest and lowest dimensions was only 0.38 points, the questionnaire data alone did not reveal a pronounced problem.

The interview findings provided a more differentiated understanding of the questionnaire results. The four clusters demonstrate that teachers' readiness was influenced by both formal training and individual learning initiatives. Teachers who had received formal training and worked in supportive institutional environments were

better able to articulate and operationalise the relationships among deep learning principles. Teachers without formal training could still achieve moderate alignment when they demonstrated independent learning initiatives, although their conceptual understanding was not always consistently translated into concrete instructional procedures.

The statements made by Cluster 3 teachers contradicted their questionnaire scores, which were consistently above 4.00. Although the questionnaire responses suggested that they possessed good teaching material design skills, several teachers acknowledged during the interviews that their classroom practices were still dominated by lectures and had not operationally incorporated deep learning principles. This discrepancy indicates a gap between normative understanding and actual design competence.

The high questionnaire scores may therefore reflect aspirational responses, in which teachers evaluated themselves according to what they believed should be implemented rather than according to the instructional designs they had actually produced. This interpretation is supported by the module review, which showed that several highly rated components were not consistently operationalised in the documents.

The document findings confirmed that meaningful learning was among the most consistently implemented principles. Most teachers successfully connected introductory learning activities with students' real-life experiences. Joyful learning was also represented through varied activities, although its implementation was not equally strong across all modules.

Mindful learning, however, revealed a notable perception–implementation gap. Although it received a questionnaire score of 4.23 and was classified as Very Good, several modules did not contain explicit mindful activities. This result suggests that mindful learning was relatively easy for teachers to recognise and claim conceptually but more difficult to translate consistently into concrete activities involving contemplation, emotional awareness, metacognition, or structured reflection.

Similar inconsistencies were observed in the application of pedagogical models. The presence of terms such as Project-Based Learning in the module identity sections did not always correspond with the instructional activities described in the modules. In some cases, the activities remained teacher-centred and receptive. This finding indicates that the inclusion of a pedagogical model as a formal label does not necessarily demonstrate its operational implementation.

A substantial discrepancy was also found in the learning partnership component. Although this component received the highest questionnaire score, most modules limited partnerships to peer interaction within the classroom. Only two modules involved stakeholders beyond the classroom, such as parents, community members, or external experts. Therefore, teachers appeared to interpret learning partnerships primarily as student collaboration rather than as broader educational partnerships extending beyond school boundaries.

The integration of digital technology was also largely consumptive. Most teachers used digital resources to present information, play videos, or access online references. Only two modules required students to create digital products. This pattern demonstrates that digital integration had not generally progressed from content consumption to productive, creative, and participatory technology use.

The differences between schools further indicate that digital integration was shaped not only by teachers' competencies but also by institutional conditions. Teachers in schools without device restrictions demonstrated richer forms of digital integration, whereas teachers in pesantren-based schools faced limitations resulting from institutional policies. Consequently, the quality of teaching material design cannot be interpreted solely as an outcome of individual teacher competence.

The critical literary literacy component represented the most substantial gap between perception and documentary evidence. Although teachers rated their reading literacy skills within the Good category, critical literary literacy was absent from most modules. This absence was partly related to the dominance of nonfiction topics in the collected documents. Nevertheless, even within nonfiction materials, reading activities generally remained at the comprehension and interpretation levels and rarely involved critical evaluation or personal reflection.

The findings on verbal communication were more consistent across the three data sources. The relatively low questionnaire score was supported by the absence of structured verbal communication rubrics in eight modules. Teachers frequently included speaking, presentation, or discussion activities but did not always provide explicit assessment criteria for evaluating the quality, structure, accuracy, or effectiveness of students' verbal communication.

By contrast, the deep learning stage cycle and structured reflection were relatively well represented in the modules. These findings show that teachers were generally able to organise learning activities into coherent stages. However, the existence of an orderly learning sequence did not automatically ensure that the modules contained adequate assessment instruments or sufficiently deep reflective activities.

The integration of twenty-first-century competencies was relatively widespread, as only one module completely omitted this component. However, the nearly equal distribution between Present and Partially Present indicates that the 4Cs had not yet been incorporated consistently and systematically. In some modules, collaboration and communication were evident through group work, but critical thinking and creativity were not explicitly supported by tasks, assessment criteria, or learning products.

Overall, the triangulation of the three data sources revealed a mutually reinforcing pattern. Dimensions associated with philosophical orientation and general learning attitudes, including meaningful learning, joyful learning, and classroom partnerships, were more readily acknowledged and incorporated by teachers. In contrast, dimensions requiring structured instruments, advanced literacy practices, external resources, and

productive digital engagement remained weaknesses across the questionnaire, interview, and document data.

The interview-based cluster classification was also validated by the document analysis. Modules produced by Cluster 1 teachers consistently demonstrated the Present status across most components. Cluster 2 modules displayed a mixed pattern of Present and Partially Present components. Modules produced by teachers in Clusters 3 and 4 more frequently contained Partially Present and Absent components, particularly those dependent on digital resources and structured assessment instruments.

The findings concerning Cluster 4 emphasise the importance of institutional context. Although these teachers had received formal training, structural restrictions limited their ability to implement their knowledge fully. Institutional policies in pesantren-based schools therefore played a determining role in establishing the upper limit of the quality of teaching modules that teachers could design and implement, regardless of their training histories or individual pedagogical competence.

These results demonstrate that strengthening teachers' teaching material design skills requires more than improving their philosophical understanding of deep learning. Professional development should emphasise the operational translation of deep learning principles into concrete instructional activities, structured assessment rubrics, critical and reflective literacy tasks, broader learning partnerships, and productive digital projects [15]. At the same time, institutional policies and resource limitations must be addressed so that trained teachers have sufficient opportunities to implement the competencies they have acquired.

CONCLUSION

Fundamental Finding: Based on the triangulation of questionnaire, interview, and teaching module document review data, Indonesian language teachers at junior high schools and Islamic junior high schools in East Lombok perceived their skills in designing teaching materials based on the deep learning paradigm as Good, with an average score of 4.04. The Deep Learning Principles dimension—meaningful, mindful, and joyful learning—obtained the highest score. However, the document review showed that these perceptions were not fully consistent with the actual content of the teaching modules, particularly in the mindful learning component, which was frequently presented as a normative statement without explicit contemplative or metacognitive activities. Teachers' readiness was associated with their formal training experience but was not determined solely by it. Teachers with formal training generally demonstrated more structured conceptual understanding, while untrained teachers who independently developed their knowledge were still able to produce moderately aligned modules. **Implication:** The most consistent gaps occurred in components requiring structured instruments and external resources, including verbal communication assessment rubrics, critical literary literacy, and productive digital technology use. Therefore, improving teachers' skills in designing deep learning-based teaching materials cannot rely solely on

individual training but must also involve institutional policy adjustments that provide teachers with adequate opportunities to integrate all dimensions of deep learning comprehensively. **Limitation:** Institutional contextual factors, particularly policies in pesantren-based schools that restrict the use of digital devices, determined the upper limit of the quality of teaching material designs that teachers could produce and implement. These barriers were structural and beyond the control of teachers' individual competencies. **Future Research:** Future research should examine the effectiveness of institutional policy adjustments and context-sensitive professional development programmes in supporting the comprehensive integration of mindful learning, critical literary literacy, structured verbal communication assessment, and productive digital technology use in teaching materials.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Fullan and M. Langworthy, *A Rich Seam: How New Pedagogies Find Deep Learning*. Pearson, 2024.

[2] M. Fullan, J. Quinn, and J. McEachen, *Deep learning: Engage the world, change the world*. Corwin, 2021.

[3] M. Fullan, J. Quinn, and J. McEachen, *Deep Learning: Engage the World, Change the World*. Corwin, 2018.

[4] Kemendikdasmen, "Pembelajaran mendalam menuju pendidikan bermutu untuk semua," Pusat Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran, Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan, 2025.

[5] Ngalimun, *Strategi dan Model Pembelajaran*. Aswaja Pressindo, 2014.

[6] N. K. D. Tristiantari, I. W. Lasmawan, I. P. Suharta, and I. G. Ratnaya, "Upaya mengembangkan profil kompetensi peserta didik di era Society 5.0 dalam perspektif ilmu pengetahuan sosial," *Polyglot: Jurnal Ilmiah*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 47–62, 2025.

[7] L. W. Anderson, D. R. Krathwohl, and B. S. Bloom, *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Longman, 2001.

[8] K. E. Simanungkalit and J. D. Damanik, "Deep learning untuk pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia: Strategi, efektivitas, dan peluang," *BORASPATI: The Journal of Bilingualism, Organization, Research, Articles, Studies in Pedagogy, Anthropology, Theory, and Indigenous Cultures*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 203–215, 2025.

[9] U. Salamah and Rokhyanto, "Pengembangan buku ajar bahasa Indonesia kontekstual dengan pendekatan deep learning," *Paradigma: Jurnal Filsafat, Sains, Teknologi, dan Sosial Budaya*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 167–185, 2025, doi: 10.33503/paradigma.v31i2.2021.

[10] Jumadi *et al.*, "Peningkatan kapasitas guru Bahasa Indonesia SD, SMP, dan SMA dalam pembelajaran berbasis deep learning di Kabupaten Kotabaru," *Jurnal Pengabdian Al-Ikhlas Universitas Islam Kalimantan*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 242–248, 2025.

[11] N. K. D. Tristiantari, D. Gunawan, D. Amelia, N. W. M. Rismadewi, K. S. Diputra, and G. A. P. S. Trisna, "Innovative deep learning-driven Indonesian language instruction: Development and effectiveness in improving elementary reading literacy," *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran, dan Pembelajaran*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2026.

[12] P. Sahlberg and A. L. Goodwin, *Only the Best Will Do: How Finland and Singapore Build Learning-Centered Education*. Teachers College Press, 2022.
[13] J. W. Creswell and V. L. Plano Clark, *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, 3rd ed. SAGE Publications, 2018.
[14] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldaña, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage, 2014.
[15] E. J. Langer, *The Power of Mindful Learning*. Addison-Wesley, 1997.

*** Ahsanul Aini (Corresponding Author)**
Hamzanwadi University, Indonesia
Email: ahsanulaini06@gmail.com

Khirjan Nahdi
Hamzanwadi University, Indonesia
Email: khirjan.nw@hamzanwadi.ac.id

Roni Amrulloh
Hamzanwadi University, Indonesia
Email: roni2017@hamzanwadi.ac.id