JIPSI: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Sains Islam Interdisipiner
Vol. 5, No. 4, November 2026, pp. 4787-4818
http://journal.amorfati.id/index.php/jipsi || ISSN 2962-9187

Interdisciplinary Scope of Science and Education, Islamic Education and Science, Integration of Science and Islam, Islamic Thought and Philosophy, Integration of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Islamic Studies, Islamic Economics and Business Studies, and Islamic Ethics in Science and Technology

Deep Learning in Indonesian EFL Instruction: A Narrative Literature Review through the SOLO Taxonomy

Kalayo Hasibuan

A Lecturer of Master of English Education Program, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Indonesia
Corresponding author: kalayo@uin-suska.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received:
27-08-2026
Revised:
23-09-2026
Accepted:
12-11-2026

Keywords: Deep Learning; Indonesian EFL Instruction; SOLO Taxonomy; Constructive Alignment; Communicative Language Teaching; Authentic Assessment; DLS-EAF

ABSTRACT

Deep learning has emerged as an important direction in Indonesian educational reform, emphasizing meaningful understanding, application, reflection, and knowledge transfer rather than the reproduction of isolated information. However, translating these principles into observable and assessable English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning outcomes remains a significant pedagogical challenge. This narrative literature review examines the theoretical foundations of deep learning in Indonesian EFL instruction, identifies implementation challenges, and explores the potential of the Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) Taxonomy to support progressive learning design and assessment. The review synthesizes literature on educational deep learning, Indonesian curriculum policy, second language acquisition, communicative and task-based language teaching, SOLO Taxonomy, constructive alignment, and EFL assessment. Literature was identified through Google Scholar, academic journal databases, Indonesian scholarly repositories, and official government publications. Explicit search terms, eligibility criteria, and thematic categories were used to organize the literature. Because the original review records did not establish a verifiable screening total, the study does not claim a specific number of studies reviewed or a systematic screening procedure. The synthesis identifies three related but insufficiently integrated strands: deep learning as a pedagogical orientation, EFL pedagogy as meaningful language use, and SOLO Taxonomy as a framework for describing the structural complexity of demonstrated understanding. To connect these strands, the article proposes the **Deep Learning–SOLO EFL Alignment Framework (DLS-EAF)**, comprising six interconnected stages: contextual engagement, conceptual-linguistic understanding, relational meaning making, authentic application, reflection, and transfer. The framework integrates deep-learning principles, SOLO-based learning progression, communicative EFL pedagogy, authentic performance, and constructive alignment among intended learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessment. Its principal contribution is a context-sensitive conceptual model for translating Indonesian deep-learning policy into observable EFL instructional practices. The article concludes that DLS-EAF offers a theoretically

grounded basis for instructional design but requires empirical testing through classroom interventions, assessment validation, and longitudinal research.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

English language education in Indonesia faces the continuing challenge of developing learners who can use English meaningfully rather than merely reproduce vocabulary, grammatical rules, and textbook information. Although linguistic knowledge remains essential, contemporary language education requires learners to interpret information, construct arguments, evaluate evidence, collaborate, solve problems, and communicate appropriately across academic, professional, and social contexts.

This challenge reflects a longstanding distinction between surface and deep approaches to learning. Marton and Säljö (1976) explain that learners may approach learning tasks either by concentrating on the reproduction of information or by seeking meaning and understanding. Entwistle (2009) further emphasizes the importance of meaningful engagement, conceptual relationships, and disciplinary understanding. Deep learning, therefore, should not be understood simply as covering more content or assigning more difficult exercises. It concerns the quality of learners' engagement with knowledge and their ability to connect, interpret, apply, and extend what they learn.

These principles are particularly relevant to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education. Language learning involves relationships among linguistic forms, meanings, communicative purposes, audiences, and social contexts. Learners must understand not only what a word or grammatical structure means but also why and how it is used in a particular situation. Lightbown and Spada (2013) demonstrate that second language development involves cognitive, instructional, interactional, and individual factors. Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (2014) explain how contemporary language teaching approaches emphasize communication, meaningful interaction, and the purposeful use of language.

In Indonesia, these pedagogical concerns have gained additional significance through the national emphasis on *Pembelajaran Mendalam*, or deep learning. The Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education presents deep learning as an approach emphasizing mindful, meaningful, and joyful learning, supported by experiences of understanding, applying, and reflecting (Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Republik Indonesia, 2025a). Related curricular policy provides the regulatory context for improving learning quality within the national curriculum (Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Republik Indonesia, 2025b).

Nevertheless, articulating the principles of deep learning does not automatically explain how teachers should design EFL instruction or determine whether students have achieved deeper understanding. Teachers need an instructional structure that connects intended learning outcomes, classroom activities, language performance, and assessment criteria. Constructive alignment offers one important foundation for addressing this challenge. Biggs and Tang (2011) argue that intended learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and assessment should be aligned so that learners engage in the kinds of activities necessary to demonstrate the intended outcomes. If an EFL learning outcome requires learners to evaluate an argument and formulate an evidence-based position, instruction must provide opportunities to interpret texts, compare perspectives, evaluate evidence, discuss alternatives, and construct an argument. Assessment must then evaluate those performances rather than merely test vocabulary recognition.

The Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) Taxonomy provides a complementary way to describe the development of learners' demonstrated understanding. Biggs and Collis (1982) distinguish five levels: prestructural, unistructural, multistructural, relational, and extended abstract. These levels describe increasing structural complexity in learners' responses, from inadequate or isolated understanding to coherent integration and the transfer of knowledge to new contexts.

The relevance of SOLO to EFL is evident when learners progress from identifying individual language features to explaining how language, meaning, evidence, audience, and purpose interact. Chubko et al. (2019), for example, demonstrated the use of SOLO to evaluate EFL students' disciplinary literacy in a technology-enhanced, integrated astronomy course. Suryani and Syahbani (2023) also examined the relationship between gamification, SOLO Taxonomy, and English language learning.

1.2 Research Gap

Existing scholarship provides important but partially separate contributions to the development of deep learning in EFL education. First, research on deep and surface approaches to learning explains why meaningful engagement, conceptual understanding, and reflection are important for educational quality (Marton & Säljö, 1976; Entwistle, 2009). Indonesian policy publications similarly articulate deep learning as a pedagogical orientation that emphasizes mindful, meaningful, and joyful experiences and the processes of understanding, applying, and reflecting. These contributions establish the educational rationale for deep learning, but broad principles alone do not specify how increasing complexity in EFL learners' understanding should be identified and assessed.

Second, research on EFL pedagogy establishes the importance of communicative competence, interaction, meaningful tasks, and authentic language use. Task-based language teaching, for example, emphasizes the use of language to accomplish purposeful outcomes (Ellis, 2003). Communicative and task-oriented approaches provide valuable pedagogical strategies, but they do not, by themselves, prescribe a single framework for describing the structural complexity of learners' demonstrated understanding across progressively demanding performances.

Third, SOLO research offers a means of analyzing the quality and complexity of learning outcomes. Its application to language learning demonstrates its potential for evaluating responses and disciplinary literacy (Biggs & Collis, 1982; Chubko et al., 2019). However, SOLO is not a complete EFL teaching methodology. It does not independently specify the linguistic input, communicative interaction, task sequence, feedback procedures, or curricular alignment required to develop language proficiency.

The problem, therefore, is not that these approaches lack theoretical value. Rather, their combined implications for designing, implementing, and assessing deep learning in

Indonesian EFL classrooms have not yet been sufficiently articulated in one coherent, context-sensitive instructional framework. The available literature supports the relevance of the individual components, but direct empirical evidence validating their integration into a unified Indonesian EFL model remains limited.

This gap is especially important because Indonesian deep-learning policy must ultimately be translated into observable classroom practices. Teachers need to know how to move from policy principles to learning outcomes, from outcomes to instructional activities, and from activities to assessment evidence that demonstrates meaningful understanding and transfer.

1.3 Purpose and Research Questions

To address this gap, the present article proposes the Deep Learning–SOLO EFL Alignment Framework (DLS-EAF), which integrates deep-learning principles, SOLO Taxonomy, communicative EFL pedagogy, authentic assessment, and constructive alignment. The article addresses four research questions:

1. What theoretical and pedagogical contributions does existing literature offer for understanding deep learning in Indonesian EFL instruction?
2. What challenges constrain the implementation of deep learning in Indonesian EFL classrooms?
3. How can SOLO Taxonomy support the design and assessment of progressively complex EFL learning outcomes?
4. How can deep-learning principles, SOLO progression, EFL pedagogy, and constructive alignment be integrated into a coherent instructional framework?

The principal contribution is conceptual rather than experimental. DLS-EAF is proposed as an instructional-design and assessment framework intended to make the relationships among learning principles, cognitive progression, language performance, and assessment more explicit.

2. Method

2.1. Type of Research

This study employed a narrative literature review to synthesize theoretical perspectives, policy documents, and research findings relevant to deep learning in Indonesian EFL education. A narrative approach was selected because the research problem spans several interconnected areas, including educational psychology, language pedagogy, cognitive development, assessment, curriculum policy, and teacher professional development. The purpose was to identify conceptual relationships and develop an integrated framework rather than calculate a pooled statistical effect or claim the exhaustive coverage associated with a systematic review.

The review addressed nine areas:

1. Deep and surface approaches to learning.
2. Indonesian *Pembelajaran Mendalam* policy.
3. English language teaching and communicative pedagogy.
4. Second language acquisition.
5. Higher-order thinking and cognitive progression.
6. SOLO Taxonomy.
7. Constructive alignment.
8. EFL curriculum and assessment.
9. Teacher readiness and contextualized learning.

2.2 Search Locations and Search Strategy

Literature was identified through Google Scholar, academic journal databases, Indonesian scholarly repositories, and official government publications. Google Scholar was used to locate relevant publications across disciplinary boundaries, while journal databases and scholarly repositories supported the identification of peer-reviewed research and Indonesian educational studies. Official government publications were consulted for the national policy context. The search employed combinations of the following terms:

- "deep learning" AND EFL;
- "Pembelajaran Mendalam" AND English;
- "deep learning" AND Indonesian education;
- "deep learning" AND EFL Indonesia;
- "SOLO Taxonomy" AND EFL;
- "SOLO Taxonomy" AND English language learning;
- "SOLO Taxonomy" AND higher-order thinking;
- "constructive alignment" AND EFL;
- "Merdeka Curriculum" AND English language teaching;
- "higher-order thinking" AND Indonesian EFL;
- "deep learning" AND assessment; and
- "deep learning" AND teacher readiness.

The search strategy combined Indonesian educational terminology with international theoretical concepts to identify both context-specific research and foundational scholarship.

The literature base included established theoretical publications, empirical studies, recent Indonesian research, and relevant policy documents. Foundational works were retained when they provided essential explanations of deep approaches to learning, SOLO Taxonomy, constructive alignment, or language pedagogy.

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Publications were considered relevant when they met at least one of the following criteria:

1. They explained deep learning as an educational or pedagogical concept.
2. They addressed Indonesian *Pembelajaran Mendalam* or relevant curriculum policy.
3. They examined EFL or English language teaching practices associated with meaningful learning.
4. They investigated communicative, task-based, or contextualized language instruction.
5. They explained or applied SOLO Taxonomy to learning progression or assessment.
6. They addressed constructive alignment, authentic assessment, or higher-order thinking.
7. They examined Indonesian EFL teacher readiness, differentiated instruction, or implementation challenges.
8. They provided foundational theoretical insights necessary to interpret the relationship between learning processes and observed outcomes.

Studies were excluded from the educational synthesis when deep learning referred exclusively to computational machine-learning techniques without a meaningful connection to educational pedagogy. Publications were evaluated for conceptual relevance, clarity of argument, appropriateness of methodology where applicable, and contribution to one or more of the review questions. Recent publications were particularly relevant to the Indonesian policy context, while older foundational works were retained for theoretical continuity.

2.4 Screening and Reporting Transparency

The available manuscript records did not contain a verified numerical account of all records identified, duplicates removed, full texts examined, and publications included. Consequently, this review does not report an invented total number of studies or present the search as a completed systematic screening process. This limitation is important for interpreting the review. The search strategy and eligibility criteria make the approach more transparent, but they do not establish that the review is exhaustive or fully reproducible. A future systematic extension should maintain a search log, document the search date and database-specific queries, record screening decisions, and report the number of publications identified, excluded, and included.

2.5 Analytical Procedure

The selected literature was organized into five thematic categories:

1. Conceptual foundations: deep learning, surface learning, meaningful understanding, reflection, and transfer.
2. EFL pedagogy: communicative language teaching, task-based learning, interaction, authentic language use, and contextualization.
3. Learning progression: SOLO Taxonomy, higher-order thinking, and the complexity of observed learning outcomes.
4. Implementation challenges: teacher readiness, assessment practices, learner diversity, curriculum demands, and technology access.
5. Instructional alignment: relationships among intended learning outcomes, learning activities, assessment, feedback, and transfer.

The synthesis proceeded by comparing the conceptual contributions of the literature, identifying areas of convergence, examining differences in theoretical emphasis, and determining where the integration of existing approaches could address the identified research problem. The DLS-EAF framework was then developed as a conceptual synthesis of these relationships. The framework should not be interpreted as the result of a formal effect-size analysis, a systematic review, or empirical validation of the integrated model.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Deep Learning as a Quality of Learning

The literature distinguishes deep learning from the simple accumulation or reproduction of information. Deep approaches involve seeking meaning, identifying relationships, and developing coherent understanding (Marton & Säljö, 1976; Entwistle, 2009). This distinction has important implications for EFL instruction. Students may memorize grammatical rules, vocabulary items, and textual information without understanding how these elements interact in communication. Deeper learning requires them to connect language knowledge with meaning, purpose, evidence, and context.

Biggs and Tang (2011) further emphasize that learning quality depends partly on the alignment of outcomes, activities, and assessment. Students are more likely to develop

the intended understanding when instructional activities and assessment consistently require them to demonstrate that understanding.

The Indonesian *Pembelajaran Mendalam* policy shares this emphasis on the quality of learning through its principles of mindful, meaningful, and joyful learning and its focus on understanding, applying, and reflecting (Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Republik Indonesia, 2025a). These principles provide a broad educational orientation. Their implementation in EFL, however, requires concrete learning tasks, appropriate linguistic scaffolding, explicit assessment criteria, and opportunities to apply and extend knowledge.

3.2 Deep Learning and EFL Pedagogy

EFL instruction is particularly suitable for deep-learning approaches because language functions both as an object of learning and as a medium through which learners construct and communicate meaning. Lightbown and Spada (2013) emphasize the importance of interaction, instructional conditions, cognitive processes, and individual differences in second language development. Richards and Rodgers (2014) similarly demonstrate that language teaching approaches differ in their conceptions of language, learning, classroom interaction, and instructional outcomes.

Task-based language teaching provides a particularly relevant connection. Ellis (2003) explains how tasks organize language learning around purposeful activity and meaningful outcomes. Learners may use English to investigate a problem, compare alternatives, negotiate a decision, produce a report, or communicate a solution. Such activities create opportunities for deeper engagement because students must mobilize language resources to achieve communicative purposes. Nevertheless, a task is not automatically an example of deep learning simply because it involves group work or produces a final product. The cognitive quality of the activity depends on what learners must understand, how they connect information, and whether they can justify, reflect on, and transfer their learning.

Recent Indonesian research has explored related possibilities. Rampeng et al. (2025) examined project-based learning integrated with deep-learning principles for speaking fluency and critical thinking. Setyoningsih et al. (2025) investigated the integration of deep learning and digital literacy in EFL reading instruction. These studies provide relevant contextual evidence for exploring deep-learning-oriented EFL practices. However,

evidence supporting particular instructional practices should not be interpreted as direct validation of the complete DLS-EAF framework.

3.3 The Problem of Cognitive Progression in EFL

A major challenge in EFL instruction is determining whether students' learning demonstrates increasingly coherent understanding rather than simply increasing amounts of information. Consider a lesson on the passive voice. At an initial level, students may identify the form *be* + *past participle*. They may subsequently identify several passive constructions in a reading passage. However, these achievements do not necessarily indicate that students understand why passive constructions are used in academic writing.

A deeper response would explain how the passive voice foregrounds the process or affected entity, how it relates to the information structure of a text, and why it may be appropriate for a particular genre or communicative purpose. An even more advanced response might compare the use of passive constructions across academic reports, news articles, and other genres and justify when a different grammatical choice would be more effective. This example illustrates the distinction between possessing linguistic knowledge and integrating that knowledge into meaningful understanding.

The pedagogical question is therefore not simply whether students can perform a more difficult exercise. It is whether their responses demonstrate stronger relationships among linguistic form, meaning, context, evidence, audience, and communicative purpose. SOLO Taxonomy provides a framework for examining this progression.

3.4 SOLO Taxonomy and EFL Learning Outcomes

Biggs and Collis (1982) developed SOLO Taxonomy to describe the structural complexity of observed learning outcomes. Its five levels are summarized below.

Table 1. SOLO Taxonomy Applied to EFL Instruction

SOLO level	Nature of understanding	Illustrative EFL performance
Prestructural	Relevant understanding is absent or inadequate.	Produces an irrelevant response or misunderstands the central message of a text.
Unistructural	One relevant aspect is identified.	Identifies the main idea, a vocabulary item, or one supporting argument.

Multistructural	Several relevant aspects are identified but remain insufficiently integrated.	Identifies several arguments or language features without explaining their relationships.
Relational	Relevant elements are integrated into a coherent structure.	Explains how claims, evidence, language choices, context, and communicative purpose are related.
Extended abstract	Understanding is generalized, extended, or transferred.	Develops an original interpretation, evaluates an argument using broader principles, or applies learning to a new context.

Source: Adapted conceptually from Biggs and Collis (1982). The EFL performances are illustrative applications rather than validated assessment descriptors.

The principal contribution of SOLO is its emphasis on the structure of demonstrated understanding. It helps distinguish between responses that list several relevant ideas and responses that integrate those ideas into a coherent explanation. SOLO is therefore potentially useful for developing learning outcomes, designing questions, analyzing student responses, providing feedback, and evaluating progress.

However, SOLO should not be treated as a rigid sequence through which every learner must progress in the same manner. Performance may vary according to the task, topic, language proficiency, prior knowledge, and available scaffolding. The taxonomy should guide assessment and instructional decisions rather than become a substitute for professional judgment.

3.5 Existing Evidence and Its Implications

Research by Chubko et al. (2019) demonstrates that SOLO can be used to evaluate EFL learners' disciplinary literacy in an integrated learning environment. Their work illustrates how students' responses can be analyzed according to the complexity of their demonstrated understanding. Suryani and Syahbani (2023) examined gamification and SOLO Taxonomy in English language learning, while Arceo (2024) investigated SOLO-based teaching in relation to cognitive learning outcomes and performance. Other studies have applied SOLO to cognitive performance in subject areas beyond language education.

This literature supports the potential relevance of SOLO to learning progression and assessment. Nevertheless, the evidence must be interpreted carefully. Evidence that SOLO can classify or analyze learner responses does not establish that SOLO alone produces deep learning. Likewise, evidence that deep-learning-oriented tasks support particular learning

outcomes does not establish that integrating those tasks with SOLO necessarily produces additional benefits.

The rationale for DLS-EAF is consequently theoretical and pedagogical: it proposes that combining these approaches may provide a more coherent instructional architecture than relying on any one component in isolation. Whether the integrated framework improves learning outcomes remains an empirical question.

3.6. Theoretical Foundations of DLS-EAF

The proposed framework draws on four complementary theoretical foundations.

3.6.1 Deep and Surface Approaches to Learning

Marton and Säljö (1976) and Entwistle (2009) provide the foundation for distinguishing reproduction-oriented learning from meaningful engagement with knowledge. Within DLS-EAF, this distinction informs the movement from identifying linguistic information toward interpreting relationships, constructing meaning, applying knowledge, and transferring understanding. Deep learning is treated as an intended quality of engagement rather than an automatic consequence of completing a task.

3.6.2 SOLO Taxonomy

SOLO provides the framework's principal structure for describing the complexity of observed learning outcomes. Its contribution is not to prescribe all teaching procedures but to clarify what increasingly integrated understanding may look like in students' actual responses. The distinction between multistructural and relational performance is especially important. Learners may identify several relevant ideas without explaining how those ideas relate to one another. DLS-EAF therefore emphasizes activities that require learners to organize, connect, interpret, and justify information. Extended-abstract performance becomes relevant when students generalize, evaluate, create, or transfer understanding to a different context.

3.6.3 Communicative and Task-Based EFL Pedagogy

Communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching provide the instructional means through which learners use English to construct and communicate meaning (Ellis, 2003; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). These approaches inform the selection of

authentic contexts, the design of meaningful tasks, and the integration of reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

Within DLS-EAF, linguistic knowledge is necessary but is not treated as the final purpose of instruction. Learners use that knowledge to understand texts, participate in interaction, produce meaningful communication, and solve problems.

3.6.4 Constructive Alignment

Constructive alignment connects the framework's learning outcomes, instructional activities, and assessment procedures (Biggs & Tang, 2011). The principle is straightforward: what learners are expected to demonstrate should determine what they practice and what teachers assess. For example, an outcome requiring students to evaluate an environmental argument and develop an evidence-based position cannot be adequately assessed through vocabulary recognition alone.

Students need opportunities to interpret arguments, distinguish claims from evidence, discuss alternative explanations, formulate a position, and communicate their reasoning. Assessment must then evaluate the quality of their reasoning and language performance. Constructive alignment therefore connects DLS-EAF's conceptual foundations with its practical implementation.

3.7. The Research Gap and Novelty of DLS-EAF

The literature synthesis identifies a need to connect three related dimensions of EFL education. The first is the pedagogical dimension, represented by deep learning and Indonesian *Pembelajaran Mendalam*. This dimension emphasizes the quality of learning experiences, meaningful understanding, application, reflection, and transfer.

The second is the cognitive-developmental dimension, represented by SOLO Taxonomy. This dimension describes the structural complexity of learners' demonstrated understanding.

The third is the instructional and assessment dimension, represented by communicative EFL pedagogy, authentic tasks, and constructive alignment. This dimension concerns how teachers design learning experiences and collect evidence of achievement. These dimensions are related, but they are not interchangeable. Deep-learning principles establish the intended quality of learning; SOLO describes the

complexity of observed understanding; and EFL pedagogy provides language-focused learning activities through which students can demonstrate that understanding.

The novelty of DLS-EAF lies in its proposed integration of these dimensions into a single instructional-design and assessment framework for Indonesian EFL education. Specifically, the framework makes four conceptual contributions:

1. Policy-to-practice translation: It translates broad deep-learning principles into a sequence of observable EFL learning experiences.
2. Cognitive progression: It uses SOLO Taxonomy to clarify how learners may move from identifying individual elements toward integrating and transferring understanding.
3. Language-performance integration: It connects cognitive progression with communicative language use rather than treating cognitive development and language proficiency as separate educational goals.
4. Constructive alignment: It connects intended learning outcomes, instructional activities, assessment evidence, feedback, and transfer.

The framework does not claim that these individual theories or practices are new. Its proposed contribution is the context-sensitive architecture that connects them. Moreover, the novelty claim is appropriately limited. The present review proposes an integrated framework based on the literature; it does not establish that no comparable framework exists or that DLS-EAF is more effective than existing models. Such claims would require a broader systematic comparison and empirical evaluation.

3.8. The Proposed Deep Learning–SOLO EFL Alignment Framework

DLS-EAF consists of six interconnected instructional stages: (1) Contextual engagement, (2) Conceptual-linguistic understanding, (3) Relational meaning making, (4) Authentic application, (5) Reflection, and (6) Transfer. These stages represent a proposed instructional progression, not a rigid linear sequence. Teachers may revisit earlier stages when learners need additional linguistic support, clarification, or feedback.

3.8.1 Contextual Engagement

Learners encounter an authentic issue, text, communicative problem, or social situation that provides a meaningful reason to use English. Possible contexts include environmental sustainability, digital citizenship, cultural identity, local community issues,

education, social media, and global challenges. For example, students might investigate plastic waste in their community and examine English-language materials discussing environmental responsibility.

The teacher activates prior knowledge, introduces the problem, establishes the communicative purpose, and identifies the learning outcomes. This stage supports meaningful engagement by connecting language learning to learners' experiences. Initial responses may be prestructural, unistructural, or more advanced, depending on students' prior knowledge.

Theoretical connection: Deep learning provides the rationale for meaningful engagement; EFL pedagogy supplies the communicative context; and SOLO helps teachers interpret the complexity of initial responses.

3.8.2 Conceptual-Linguistic Understanding

Learners develop the vocabulary, grammatical knowledge, discourse awareness, and conceptual understanding necessary to engage with the topic. In the environmental example, students might learn vocabulary related to waste management, distinguish factual statements from opinions, identify claims and supporting evidence, and examine language used to express recommendations.

Reading and listening activities provide input, while guided noticing and short exercises help learners understand relevant language features. The teacher provides scaffolding through vocabulary lists, sentence frames, annotated texts, model responses, and focused explanations.

This stage is associated particularly with unistructural and multistructural responses, although students may demonstrate more complex understanding when they already possess relevant knowledge.

Theoretical connection**:** Second language learning research supports attention to linguistic resources and meaningful input; SOLO describes the structure of the knowledge demonstrated; and constructive alignment ensures that foundational learning supports the intended outcomes.

3.8.3 Relational Meaning Making

Learners connect linguistic forms, ideas, evidence, context, audience, and communicative purpose. In the environmental example, students compare different arguments about plastic waste, identify relationships between claims and evidence,

evaluate the credibility of sources, and explain how language choices influence the persuasiveness of a text.

Teachers may use concept maps, collaborative discussion, comparative reading, guided questions, and analytical writing. The central objective is to move beyond listing information toward explaining relationships. A student who identifies three causes of plastic pollution demonstrates multistructural understanding. A student who explains how consumption patterns, waste-management systems, and public behavior interact demonstrates a more relational response.

Theoretical connection: SOLO provides the principal developmental descriptor for this stage; deep learning emphasizes meaningful relationships; and communicative pedagogy provides opportunities for learners to explain and negotiate meaning.

3.8.4 Authentic Application

Learners use English to accomplish a meaningful communicative or problem-solving purpose. Possible products include:

1. An evidence-based argumentative essay.
2. A group presentation.
3. A podcast or recorded discussion.
4. A public-awareness campaign.
5. An interview report.
6. A community proposal.
7. A debate or collaborative problem-solving activity.

In the environmental example, students might prepare an English-language proposal recommending practical strategies to reduce plastic waste in their school. Assessment should consider both language performance and the quality of students' reasoning. Relevant criteria may include grammatical and lexical appropriateness, organization, coherence, evidence use, audience awareness, and achievement of the communicative purpose. Authentic application is not restricted to advanced learners. Beginning learners can participate through scaffolded dialogues, short presentations, or guided written recommendations.

Theoretical connection: Task-based pedagogy explains the role of purposeful language use; constructive alignment links the task to the intended outcome; and SOLO supports the evaluation of the complexity of the resulting performance.

3.8.5 Reflection

Learners examine what they have learned, how they learned it, which strategies were effective, and what they could improve. Reflection may be conducted through learning journals, self-assessment, peer feedback, teacher conferences, or short reflective reports.

Students might consider the following questions:

- Which ideas did I understand most clearly?
- How did I connect evidence with my argument?
- Which English expressions helped me communicate my position?
- What feedback improved my work?
- Which parts of my argument remain weak?
- How could I improve my communication for a different audience?

Reflection supports metacognitive awareness and provides information for subsequent instructional decisions. It should not be assigned merely as an additional written activity. Instead, learners should use reflection to identify the relationship between their intentions, strategies, performance, and learning outcomes.

Theoretical connection: Deep learning emphasizes reflection as part of meaningful engagement; constructive alignment connects reflection to intended outcomes; and SOLO can help learners and teachers examine changes in the complexity of demonstrated understanding.

3.8.6 Transfer

Learners apply their knowledge, language resources, and reasoning strategies to a new context. After completing the environmental project, students might examine food waste, water conservation, or responsible consumption. They would need to adapt their knowledge to a different issue rather than reproduce the original presentation. Transfer is particularly relevant to extended-abstract performance because learners must generalize, reinterpret, or apply understanding beyond the original task.

However, transfer should not be assumed simply because a student completes a new assignment. Teachers need evidence that the learner can independently apply relevant principles, adapt language choices, and justify decisions in the new situation.

Theoretical connection: Extended-abstract SOLO performance provides a useful descriptor for transfer; deep learning emphasizes applying and extending understanding; and constructive alignment requires assessment tasks that make transfer observable.

3.8.7 Overall Instructional Sequence

The framework can be represented as follows:

Authentic context or communicative problem

↓

1. Contextual engagement

Activate experience, establish relevance, and identify the learning purpose.

↓

2. Conceptual-linguistic understanding

Develop language resources and foundational conceptual knowledge.

SOLO emphasis: Unistructural → Multistructural

↓

3. Relational meaning making

Connect language, ideas, evidence, context, and purpose.

SOLO emphasis: Relational

↓

4. Authentic application

Use English to communicate, create, evaluate, or solve a meaningful problem.

SOLO emphasis: Relational → Extended Abstract

↓

5. Reflection

Evaluate understanding, strategies, language choices, and feedback.

↓

6. Transfer

Apply and adapt learning to a new problem or communicative context.

SOLO emphasis: Extended Abstract

↓

Intended outcome: Deep EFL learning

Meaningful understanding + communicative competence + coherent reasoning + reflection + transferable learning

Figure 1. Proposed Deep Learning–SOLO EFL Alignment Framework (DLS-EAF).

The sequence is intended to support instructional planning rather than prescribe an inflexible progression. Teachers should use formative assessment to determine whether learners need additional input, further practice, or opportunities to extend their understanding.

3.9. Comparing DLS-EAF with Existing Frameworks

DLS-EAF should be understood in relation to established approaches rather than as a replacement for them.

Table 2. Conceptual Comparison of DLS-EAF and Existing Frameworks

Framework	Primary emphasis	Contribution to EFL instruction	Relationship to DLS-EAF
Revised Bloom's Taxonomy	Cognitive processes, including remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating.	Helps teachers formulate objectives and select cognitive operations.	Complements SOLO by identifying the cognitive process involved while SOLO describes the structural complexity of the demonstrated outcome.
SOLO Taxonomy	Structural complexity of observed learning outcomes.	Helps teachers interpret responses, identify levels of understanding, and provide developmental feedback.	Supplies the principal progression framework within DLS-EAF.
Constructive alignment	Alignment of intended learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessment.	Supports coherent course, lesson, and assessment design.	Provides the alignment principle connecting the framework's stages.
Communicative language teaching	Meaningful communication and communicative competence.	Encourages interaction, purposeful language use, and attention to communicative context.	Informs the design of contextualized activities and authentic language performance.
Task-based language teaching	Language learning through tasks with meaningful outcomes.	Provides a practical structure for communicative activity and language use.	Supports authentic application and the use of English to accomplish purposeful goals.
DLS-EAF	Integration of deep learning, SOLO progression, EFL pedagogy, and	Connects learning principles, cognitive progression, language	Proposes an integrated instructional-design and assessment architecture

	constructive alignment.	performance, reflection, and transfer. for Indonesian EFL contexts.

Note: This table presents a conceptual comparison of theoretical emphases, not the results of an exhaustive systematic review of every existing framework.

3.9.1 Relationship with Bloom's Revised Taxonomy

Bloom's revised taxonomy describes cognitive processes, whereas SOLO describes the structural complexity of the resulting learning outcome (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Biggs & Collis, 1982). For example, a teacher may ask students to analyze an environmental text. Bloom's taxonomy helps identify the cognitive process as analysis. SOLO can then help determine whether the student identifies several separate points or integrates the points into a coherent explanation.

Similarly, a task may require students to create an argumentative essay. The fact that the task involves creation does not guarantee that the resulting argument demonstrates coherent reasoning or transferable understanding. DLS-EAF therefore uses the two taxonomies complementarily: Bloom helps specify the intended cognitive activity, while SOLO helps describe the complexity of demonstrated understanding.

3.9.2 Relationship with Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching

Communicative and task-based approaches already provide strong foundations for meaningful EFL instruction. DLS-EAF does not claim to replace these approaches or establish that authentic tasks are unique to the proposed framework. Its contribution is to connect such tasks explicitly to a progression of learning outcomes, formative assessment, reflection, and transfer.

A communicative activity becomes part of deep-learning-oriented instruction when it requires learners to construct meaning, establish relationships, justify interpretations, and demonstrate the intended learning outcomes.

3.9.3 Relationship with Constructive Alignment

Constructive alignment provides the principle that connects the framework's components. DLS-EAF extends this principle conceptually by using SOLO progression to clarify the complexity of the intended outcome and by specifying how contextual engagement, language development, relational reasoning, authentic performance, reflection, and transfer can contribute to that outcome.

The framework therefore combines an instructional sequence with an assessment logic. It proposes that the quality of learning should be evaluated through evidence of both language performance and the complexity of the understanding demonstrated.

3.9.4 What Is Distinctive About DLS-EAF?

The framework's proposed distinctiveness lies in the integration of five elements:

1. Indonesian deep-learning policy as the contextual orientation.
2. SOLO Taxonomy as a descriptor of learning progression.
3. Communicative and task-based EFL pedagogy as the instructional means.
4. Constructive alignment as the organizing principle.
5. Reflection and transfer as explicit dimensions of learning beyond immediate task completion.

This integration offers a practical way to connect policy, instruction, and assessment. Its added value, however, remains a proposition to be examined through empirical research.

3.10 Operationalizing DLS-EAF in EFL Classrooms

The framework becomes useful when translated into observable learning outcomes, classroom activities, and assessment evidence.

Table 3. Instructional Alignment within DLS-EAF

Stage	Teacher's role	Learner activity	SOLO emphasis	Assessment evidence
Contextual engagement	Contextualizer and facilitator	Discuss prior experiences and interpret an initial problem.	Initial responses may range from prestructural to extended abstract.	Diagnostic responses and prior-knowledge discussion.
Conceptual-linguistic understanding	Instructor and scaffold provider	Read, listen, identify language features, and organize relevant information.	Unistructural and multistructural, where appropriate.	Vocabulary tasks, comprehension responses, and information maps.
Relational meaning making	Questioner and discussion facilitator	Compare ideas, analyze evidence, and explain relationships.	Relational.	Analytical explanations, concept maps, and evidence-based responses.

Authentic application	Learning partner and performance coach	Write, speak, debate, present, or create a project.	Relational to extended abstract, depending on task demands.	Speaking performances, written texts, presentations, and projects.
Reflection	Feedback provider and learning coach	Evaluate progress, strategies, language choices, and feedback.	Depends on the complexity of reflection demonstrated.	Learning journals, peer feedback, and revised work.
Transfer	Mentor and facilitator	Apply knowledge to a new issue or communicative context.	Extended abstract when genuine generalization is demonstrated.	New-context performance, portfolios, and transfer tasks.

The table should not be interpreted as assigning each stage exclusively to one SOLO level. The taxonomy describes the quality of demonstrated understanding, not a mandatory stage-by-stage classification of every classroom activity.

3.10.1 Constructive Alignment in Practice

Consider the following intended learning outcome: *Students will evaluate an environmental argument and produce an evidence-based recommendation in English for a specified audience*. This outcome requires learners to interpret information, distinguish claims from evidence, evaluate arguments, and communicate a justified position.

The learning sequence should therefore include relevant reading and listening input, vocabulary and discourse analysis, comparison of arguments, collaborative discussion, supported writing, feedback, and opportunities to revise the final product. Assessment should examine:

- Accuracy and appropriateness of language.
- Organization and coherence.
- Integration of claims and supporting evidence.
- Quality of reasoning.
- Awareness of audience and purpose.
- Responsiveness to feedback.
- Ability to apply relevant principles in a new context.

A vocabulary quiz may be useful as a formative activity, but it cannot independently establish achievement of the complete outcome. This example illustrates how DLS-EAF

connects linguistic learning with the structural complexity of understanding and the requirements of constructive alignment.

3.11 Assessment within DLS-EAF

Assessment is central to the proposed framework because teachers need evidence that learners are developing meaningful understanding rather than merely completing activities. DLS-EAF recommends combining linguistic criteria with SOLO-informed descriptors of cognitive complexity.

Table 4. Illustrative SOLO-Informed EFL Assessment Rubric

Dimension	Multistructural performance	Relational performance	Extended-abstract performance
Content understanding	Presents several relevant ideas.	Integrates ideas into a coherent explanation.	Develops an original synthesis or generalization.
Language use	Uses several relevant expressions and structures.	Selects language appropriate to meaning, audience, and purpose.	Uses language flexibly and strategically across contexts.
Reasoning	Identifies information and arguments.	Explains relationships among claims, evidence, and conclusions.	Evaluates assumptions, develops broader principles, or transfers reasoning.
Communication	Communicates relevant information.	Produces coherent and appropriately organized communication.	Adapts communication strategically to a new audience or context.
Reflection and transfer	Identifies what was learned.	Explains learning decisions and applies feedback.	Critically evaluates learning and adapts understanding to a new context.

Note: This is an illustrative rubric for instructional development, not a psychometrically validated assessment instrument. Teachers should adapt its descriptors to learner proficiency, task requirements, and educational level.

The rubric should complement rather than replace analytic language assessment. SOLO describes the structural complexity of understanding, while linguistic criteria address accuracy, fluency, intelligibility, coherence, and communicative effectiveness as appropriate to the task. Assessment should also be formative. Teachers can use student responses to identify misconceptions, provide targeted feedback, adjust scaffolding, and design subsequent tasks. Where feasible, assessment studies should examine the clarity of

rubric descriptors, agreement among raters, reliability, validity, and sensitivity to changes in learner performance.

3.12 Implementation Challenges

3.12.1 Teacher Readiness

Deep-learning-oriented instruction requires teachers to make deliberate decisions about learning outcomes, questioning, task design, assessment, feedback, and classroom interaction. Teachers may understand the principles of deep learning without knowing how to translate them into lesson plans or assess the complexity of students' responses. Professional development should therefore include practical opportunities to design aligned lessons, develop SOLO-informed rubrics, analyze student work, and revise instruction in response to assessment evidence.

Rahayu et al. (2026) examined professional development for implementing deep learning in English teaching within Indonesian madrasah contexts. This work highlights the relevance of teacher preparation to the implementation agenda, although it should not be interpreted as direct validation of DLS-EAF.

3.12.2 Learner Diversity

Indonesian EFL classrooms include learners with different proficiency levels, prior educational experiences, motivation, linguistic backgrounds, and access to learning resources. Requiring all students to complete the same complex task without appropriate support may disadvantage learners who need more linguistic preparation.

Differentiation can provide different pathways toward shared meaningful outcomes. Beginning learners may receive vocabulary banks, sentence frames, annotated texts, and guided questions. More proficient learners may independently compare sources, evaluate arguments, and construct extended responses. The intended learning outcome can remain ambitious while the instructional support varies according to learners' needs.

3.12.3 Assessment Practices

Assessment systems that prioritize easily scored responses may create tensions with the goals of deep learning. However, foundational knowledge and standardized assessment are not inherently incompatible with meaningful learning.

The challenge is to ensure that assessment provides evidence appropriate to the intended outcome. Vocabulary quizzes and grammar exercises remain useful for diagnosing linguistic knowledge. They should be complemented by assessment of interpretation, interaction, coherent reasoning, authentic language use, reflection, and transfer when these capabilities are part of the learning outcomes.

3.12.4 Curriculum Demands and Time Constraints

Teachers may face substantial curriculum requirements, limited instructional time, and expectations to prepare learners for examinations. DLS-EAF should therefore not be interpreted as requiring every lesson to contain six lengthy activities. The stages can be distributed across a sequence of lessons, incorporated into existing units, or adapted to shorter learning cycles. For example, contextual engagement and conceptual-linguistic understanding may occur during one lesson, while relational meaning making, authentic application, and reflection may be developed over subsequent lessons. The framework should support coherence and purposeful progression rather than unnecessarily increase instructional workload.

3.13. Technology and Generative Artificial Intelligence

Digital technologies and generative artificial intelligence can support EFL learning, but technological use does not automatically constitute deep learning. In educational policy, *Pembelajaran Mendalam* refers to a pedagogical orientation. In computer science, deep learning refers to a family of machine-learning techniques. These meanings should be distinguished when discussing educational technology.

Generative AI may help learners brainstorm ideas, compare alternative expressions, receive language feedback, or examine different interpretations of a text. However, its educational value depends on how learners engage with the output. Within DLS-EAF, AI-supported activities should require learners to exercise judgment. For example, students might compare an AI-generated environmental argument with source texts, verify factual claims, identify unsupported reasoning, revise the argument, and explain their revisions.

Teachers should establish appropriate expectations regarding source verification, privacy, attribution, academic integrity, and responsible technology use. AI should support rather than replace students' reasoning and communicative performance. Assessment

should make it possible to distinguish learners' own understanding from unverified or unacknowledged generated content.

3.14 Discussion

The literature synthesis and theoretical analysis support five central arguments.

3.14.1 Deep Learning Requires Classroom-Level Operationalization

Indonesian deep-learning policy provides an important orientation toward meaningful educational experiences. However, policy principles become instructionally useful only when teachers translate them into observable learning outcomes, purposeful activities, and appropriate assessment.

DLS-EAF proposes one way to make this translation explicit. It connects contextual engagement, language development, relational reasoning, authentic performance, reflection, and transfer. The contribution is not a claim that these practices are individually new. Rather, the framework offers a structured way to connect them to the goals of Indonesian EFL education.

3.14.2 EFL Provides Opportunities to Integrate Language and Thinking

EFL learning involves more than the acquisition of linguistic forms. Learners use language to interpret information, communicate ideas, evaluate evidence, and participate in social and academic practices. Communicative and task-based approaches already support these goals (Ellis, 2003; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). DLS-EAF complements these approaches by making the progression of understanding and its assessment more explicit.

Its central pedagogical proposition is that language development and cognitive development can be supported together when students engage in appropriately scaffolded tasks requiring meaningful interpretation and communication.

3.14.3 SOLO Makes the Complexity of Understanding More Observable

Terms such as critical thinking, meaningful learning, and higher-order thinking can be difficult to translate into consistent assessment decisions. SOLO contributes a way to examine the structure of students' responses. It distinguishes the identification of several separate elements from their integration into a coherent explanation and the extension of understanding to new contexts.

Nevertheless, SOLO is a descriptive framework, not a guarantee of deep learning. Teachers must still provide suitable instructional experiences, language support, feedback, and opportunities for meaningful performance.

3.14.4 Constructive Alignment Connects the Framework's Components

The proposed framework depends on coherence among outcomes, activities, and assessment. If students are expected to evaluate an argument, the instructional sequence must provide opportunities to interpret and compare arguments. If they are expected to communicate effectively, they need opportunities to practice language use for the relevant audience and purpose. If they are expected to transfer knowledge, assessment must include a context in which transfer can be observed. Constructive alignment provides the organizing principle for these decisions (Biggs & Tang, 2011).

DLS-EAF consequently treats assessment not merely as a final measurement but as an integral part of instructional planning and feedback.

3.14.5 The Framework's Added Value Requires Empirical Examination

The comparison with existing approaches clarifies the proposed contribution of DLS-EAF. Bloom's taxonomy identifies cognitive processes; SOLO describes the complexity of observed learning outcomes; communicative and task-based approaches inform language-learning activities; and constructive alignment connects outcomes, activities, and assessment. DLS-EAF brings these elements together within a context-sensitive instructional sequence designed for Indonesian EFL education.

However, conceptual coherence is not equivalent to empirical effectiveness. The literature supports the relevance of the framework's components, but it does not yet establish that their integration produces superior outcomes. Future studies must determine whether DLS-EAF is practical for teachers, understandable to learners, reliable as an assessment framework, and effective in supporting language proficiency and deeper understanding.

3.15 Theoretical Contributions and Practical Implications

3.15.1 Theoretical Contributions

The article offers three principal theoretical contributions. First, it connects Indonesian deep-learning policy with classroom-level EFL pedagogy by specifying a

sequence of instructional experiences that can support meaningful understanding, application, reflection, and transfer.

Second, it integrates SOLO Taxonomy with communicative language learning. This connection emphasizes that increasingly complex language performance should involve not only more linguistic information but also stronger relationships among meaning, evidence, context, and communicative purpose.

Third, it connects the progression of understanding with constructive alignment. By relating intended outcomes, instructional activities, assessment criteria, and transfer tasks, the framework provides a conceptual basis for coherent instructional design.

The resulting theoretical proposition can be summarized as follows:
Deep-learning principles → Contextual EFL engagement → Conceptual-linguistic development → SOLO-informed progression → Authentic language performance → Reflection → Transfer This proposition represents the conceptual basis of DLS-EAF. Its explanatory value and practical effectiveness remain open to empirical examination.

3.15.2 Implications for EFL Teachers

Teachers can use the framework to:

1. Formulate observable and appropriately challenging learning outcomes.
2. Connect language learning to meaningful contexts.
3. Scaffold learners from foundational linguistic knowledge toward relational understanding.
4. Design communicative tasks that require interpretation, reasoning, and authentic language use.
5. Develop formative assessment criteria informed by SOLO Taxonomy.
6. Provide feedback on both language performance and the quality of reasoning.
7. Incorporate self-assessment and reflection.
8. Create opportunities for transfer to new communicative contexts.

3.13.3 Implications for Curriculum Designers

Curriculum designers can use DLS-EAF as a conceptual guide when aligning course outcomes, learning activities, assessment, and learning resources. The framework may be adapted to unit plans, lesson plans, assessment rubrics, and project-based learning

sequences. However, its use should remain responsive to curricular requirements, learner characteristics, and available instructional resources.

3.15.4 Implications for Teacher Education

Teacher education programs should provide opportunities for future teachers to develop competence in deep-learning pedagogy, SOLO Taxonomy, communicative task design, constructive alignment, formative assessment, differentiated instruction, and responsible educational technology use. Teacher candidates should also practice analyzing student responses and revising instructional activities based on evidence of learning.

3.15.5 Implications for School Leadership

School leaders can support implementation through collaborative lesson planning, professional learning communities, mentoring, appropriate learning resources, and opportunities for classroom-based inquiry. Successful implementation should be evaluated through observable improvements in instructional coherence and learner performance rather than the adoption of new terminology alone.

3.16 Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study employed a narrative literature review rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis. Although the search locations, terms, eligibility criteria, and analytical themes are specified, the absence of a verified screening log and complete numerical record limits reproducibility and prevents claims of exhaustive coverage.

Second, the review combines theoretical literature, empirical research, and policy publications with different purposes and evidentiary strengths. These sources should not be treated as equivalent forms of evidence.

Third, direct empirical evidence concerning the integrated implementation of deep learning and SOLO Taxonomy in Indonesian EFL classrooms remains limited in the literature examined. Research supporting individual components does not establish the effectiveness of the complete framework.

Fourth, DLS-EAF is a conceptual instructional-design and assessment framework. It has not yet been validated as a complete model through systematic classroom intervention, psychometric assessment, or longitudinal research.

Fifth, the framework is designed primarily for Indonesian EFL contexts. Its applicability to other educational systems requires consideration of local curricula, language policies, institutional conditions, and learner characteristics.

These limitations define the appropriate scope of the contribution: DLS-EAF offers a theoretically informed proposal for instructional design, not an established claim of causal effectiveness.

3.17 Future Research Agenda

Further research is needed to evaluate the practicality, reliability, and educational value of DLS-EAF.

3.17.1 Classroom Intervention Studies

Classroom studies could compare conventional EFL instruction with deep-learning-oriented instruction and instruction explicitly incorporating SOLO-informed progression. Possible outcomes include reading comprehension, writing quality, speaking performance, critical thinking, metacognitive awareness, and transfer. Where feasible, studies should use appropriate comparison conditions, clearly defined instructional procedures, and valid outcome measures. Such research could help determine whether the integration of SOLO adds measurable value beyond deep-learning-oriented EFL instruction alone.

3.17.2 Longitudinal Research

Longitudinal studies could examine how learners' demonstrated understanding develops across units, academic years, or educational levels. Researchers could investigate whether students increasingly integrate linguistic knowledge, evidence, and context and whether such development is sustained across different genres and communicative tasks.

3.17.3 Assessment Validation

Research should evaluate the clarity, reliability, validity, and practicality of SOLO-informed EFL assessment rubrics. Studies could examine agreement among raters, consistency across tasks, sensitivity to learning progress, and the relationship between SOLO descriptors and established measures of language proficiency. Assessment research should also investigate how linguistic accuracy, communicative effectiveness, and cognitive complexity can be evaluated together without confusing distinct constructs.

3.17.4 Teacher Professional Development

Studies could investigate how professional development influences teachers' ability to formulate aligned outcomes, design authentic tasks, interpret student responses, and provide feedback. Classroom observations, teacher interviews, lesson-plan analysis, and student work could help establish which forms of professional learning best support implementation.

3.17.5 Comparative Framework Studies

Future studies could compare DLS-EAF with existing instructional-design approaches in terms of usability, alignment, assessment clarity, teacher workload, and learner outcomes. A systematic literature review could also establish more precisely how DLS-EAF relates to existing integrated models and whether its proposed combination of components offers distinctive practical advantages.

3.17.6 Digital and AI-Supported Learning

Research could investigate how DLS-EAF operates in technology-supported environments, including AI-assisted writing, digital reading, online collaboration, and multimedia projects. Particular attention should be given to learners' independent reasoning, source verification, language development, and responsible use of AI-generated material.

Conclusion

Deep learning offers an important orientation for Indonesian EFL education because meaningful language learning requires more than memorizing vocabulary, grammatical rules, and textual information. Learners need to interpret meaning, connect ideas, evaluate evidence, communicate effectively, reflect on their learning, and apply knowledge in new contexts.

Indonesian *Pembelajaran Mendalam* policy provides a relevant foundation through its emphasis on mindful, meaningful, and joyful learning and the experiences of understanding, applying, and reflecting. However, these principles require practical instructional structures if they are to become observable learning outcomes.

This narrative literature review has examined the contributions of deep-learning theory, communicative and task-based EFL pedagogy, SOLO Taxonomy, and constructive

alignment. The synthesis suggests that these approaches address complementary dimensions of the educational problem. Deep learning establishes the intended quality of engagement; EFL pedagogy provides opportunities for meaningful language use; SOLO describes the complexity of demonstrated understanding; and constructive alignment connects learning outcomes, instructional activities, and assessment.

The article proposes the Deep Learning–SOLO EFL Alignment Framework (DLS-EAF), comprising contextual engagement, conceptual-linguistic understanding, relational meaning making, authentic application, reflection, and transfer. Its principal contribution is the integration of these dimensions into a context-sensitive conceptual framework for Indonesian EFL instructional design and assessment.

The framework does not replace established approaches or claim that its individual components are new. Rather, it proposes a coherent structure through which deep-learning principles can be translated into classroom practices and assessed through evidence of increasingly integrated understanding and meaningful language performance.

Importantly, the framework remains a theoretical proposal. Its effectiveness, reliability, and practical feasibility must be established through empirical research, including classroom interventions, assessment validation, longitudinal studies, and comparative investigations.

Ultimately, the educational value of DLS-EAF will depend on whether it helps teachers design coherent learning experiences and enables students to move beyond reproducing information toward understanding, communicating, reflecting, and transferring their learning meaningfully.

References

Ambarita, J., Purnamasari, U., & Siahaya, A. (2025). Deep learning as a pathway to pedagogical transformation in Indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian Kebijakan Pendidikan, 18*(1). https://doi.org/10.24832/jpkp.v18i1.1229

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.

Anggraini, Y. (2025). The application of deep learning in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning. *Journal of Inspirational English Language Teaching, 2*(1), 98–116. https://doi.org/10.33830/joint.v2i1.12434

Arceo, K. M. M. (2024). Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy based teaching on the students cognitive learning outcome and performance. *International Journal of Research Publication, 149*(1), 187–203. https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001491520246512

Biggs, J. B., & Collis, K. F. (1982). *Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO taxonomy*. Academic Press.

Biggs, J. B., & Collis, K. F. (1991). Multimodal learning and the quality of intelligent behavior. In H. Rowe (Ed.), *Intelligence: Reconceptualization and measurement*. Australian Council for Educational Research.

Biggs, J. B., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press.

Chubko, N., Morris, J. E., McKinnon, D. H., Slater, E. V., & Lummis, G. W. (2019). SOLO taxonomy as EFL students' disciplinary literacy evaluation tool in technology-enhanced integrated astronomy course. *Language Testing in Asia, 9*, Article 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0095-6

Dewi, A. R. F., & Asrori, M. (2024). Analyzing essay reading questions in the "Joyful English" textbook using revised Bloom's Taxonomy. *English Education Journal, 13*(1).

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Entwistle, N. (2009). *Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Fatikhah, W., Sukoriyanto, & Rahayuningsih, S. (2024). Analysis of students' responses in solving mathematical problems based on SOLO Taxonomy viewed from gender. *ELSE: Elementary School Education Journal, 8*(3). https://doi.org/10.30651/else.v8i3.24365

Juwita, R., Sukmawati, F., Santosa, E. B., Cahyono, B. T., Prihatin, R., Suparmi, S., Ridhani, J., & Trisnaningsih, S. (2025). How to differentiate instruction for deeper learning using cognitive task analysis. *Jurnal Penelitian Kebijakan Pendidikan, 18*(2). https://doi.org/10.24832/jpkp.v18i2.1312

Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Republik Indonesia. (2025a). *Pembelajaran mendalam: Pendekatan pembelajaran menuju pendidikan bermutu untuk semua*. Sistem Informasi Kurikulum Nasional.

Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Republik Indonesia. (2025b). *Permendikdasmen Nomor 13 Tahun 2025 tentang perubahan atas Permendikbudristek Nomor 12 Tahun 2024*. Sistem Informasi Kurikulum Nasional.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1976). On qualitative differences in learning: I—Outcome and process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46*(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1976.tb02980.x

Ningsih, S., Riyadi, R., Sudarman, & Rahayu, V. P. (2025). Students' thinking skills in solving HOTS standardized problems based on the SOLO Taxonomy of economics subjects at senior high school. *Journal of Economic Education and Entrepreneurship Studies, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.62794/je3s.v6i1.7329

Rahayu, P., Murtafi'ah, B., Prasetya, W., & Widyastuti, N. (2026). Pelatihan implementasi pembelajaran mendalam (deep learning) dalam pengajaran Bahasa Inggris di MGMP Madrasah Aliyah DIY. *Jurnal Abdimas Madani dan Lestari, 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.20885/jamali.vol8.iss1.art25

Rahmawati, Y., Mu'ti, A., Suyanto, & Herianingtyas, N. L. R. (2025). Pembelajaran mendalam: Transformasi pembelajaran menuju pendidikan bermutu. *Jurnal Penelitian Kebijakan Pendidikan, 18*(1). https://doi.org/10.24832/jpkp.v18i1.1281

Rampeng, R., Hamid, R. J., Maing, R. A., & Sujariati. (2025). Integrating project-based learning and deep learning principles to foster speaking fluency and critical thinking in EFL. *Jo-ELT: Journal of English Language Teaching, 12*(2). https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v12i2.17578

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Setyoningsih, S., Susanto, D. A., Aldizeeri, M. M., & Adeoye, M. A. (2025). Integrating deep learning and digital literacy into reading instruction to achieve SDG 4: A study in a high school EFL education context in Central Java. *JOALL: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature, 10*(2). https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v10i2.43679

Suryani, N. Y., & Syahbani, M. H. (2023). Gamification and SOLO Taxonomy: A strategy to promote active engagement and discipline in English language learning. *English Review: Journal of English Education, 11*(3). https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i3.8544

Widiastuti, M. K., & Mbato, C. L. (2025). LOTS and HOTS reading questions in EFL textbooks (Kurikulum Merdeka): Unveiling every learning process purposes. *JOALL: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature, 10*(1), 48–70. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v10i1.37765