

From Policy Adoption to Teacher Capacity: Professional Learning in an Indonesian Merdeka Curriculum Pilot School

Dewi Fortuna Arassy¹, Reno Fernandes^{2*}

¹SMA Negeri 1 Bayung Lencir, Indonesia

²Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

*Corresponding author, e-mail: renofernandes@fis.unp.ac.id

Abstract

Curriculum reform can be formally adopted before teachers have developed the professional capacity needed to enact it. This qualitative secondary analysis examines how an Indonesian public secondary school participating in the national Sekolah Penggerak initiative built teacher capacity during its early transition to the Merdeka Curriculum. The analysis reuses an archived 2023 case-study corpus that had previously supported a publication on general school implementation strategies; the present manuscript asks a distinct question and returns to the full thesis corpus of nine school informants, observations, and documentary materials. Reanalysis focused on shared sensemaking, professional learning activities, translation of curriculum knowledge into classroom practice, organizational supports, and reflection. The findings show a five-part capacity-building cycle: socialization and deliberation established a shared interpretation of reform; in-house training, workshops, webinars, subject-teacher forums, and a study visit expanded professional knowledge; diagnostic assessment and differentiated learning connected that knowledge to classroom decisions; digital and material infrastructure enabled new practices; and evaluation generated new professional-learning needs. The study argues that curriculum implementation is better understood as an iterative capacity-practice-reflection cycle than as compliance with a sequence of policy requirements. This interpretation extends early Indonesian Merdeka Curriculum studies by specifying the organizational mechanism through which professional learning becomes classroom enactment.

Keywords: curriculum implementation; Merdeka Curriculum; professional learning;; school reform; teacher capacity.

How to Cite: Arassy, D. F. & Fernandes, R. (2025). From Policy Adoption to Teacher Capacity: Professional Learning in an Indonesian Merdeka Curriculum Pilot School. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 2(1), 18-26.



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2025 by author.

Introduction

Curriculum reform is often described through policy documents, new learning outcomes, assessment rules, or revised teaching materials. Yet the decisive work of reform occurs inside schools, where teachers must interpret unfamiliar concepts and convert them into practical decisions about planning, classroom interaction, assessment, and student support. A curriculum can therefore be officially adopted while remaining only partially enacted. This distinction between policy adoption and pedagogical enactment is especially important during the early years of the Merdeka Curriculum, when Indonesian schools were learning new terminology and practices while continuing to serve students under ordinary organizational constraints.

The Merdeka Curriculum was introduced with greater flexibility for schools and teachers, an emphasis on learning outcomes, diagnostic assessment, differentiated instruction, and the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5), within the national implementation framework formalized for learning recovery

(Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, 2022). These features were intended to support learning recovery and more responsive teaching, but flexibility also increases professional demands. Teachers have to make judgments rather than simply follow a fixed sequence of content. Early studies accordingly reported that readiness, understanding, leadership, collaboration, and access to professional support were central to implementation (Angga et al., 2022; Rahayu et al., 2022; Solehudin et al., 2022; Sumarsih et al., 2022).

Research on Sekolah Penggerak also highlighted the role of school leadership and institutional preparation. Dowansiba and Hermanto (2022) identified human-resource development, new learning paradigms, data-based planning, and infrastructure as strategic domains for preparing a pilot school. Fauzi (2022) and Hasibuan et al. (2022) similarly documented how implementation depended on school-level adjustment rather than automatic policy transmission. These studies helped establish a broad map of implementation problems, but the category of teacher readiness often remained an outcome label rather than a process that could be unpacked analytically.

A second strand of research examined more specific components of readiness. Rosidah et al. (2021) showed that authentic assessment requires preparation, implementation, analysis, and reporting capacities. Naufalin et al. (2023) linked teacher readiness to factors surrounding authentic assessment, while Dirgantoro and Soesanto (2023) showed that prospective teachers and teacher-education institutions also faced conceptual and practical demands in preparing for the new curriculum. Studies across school levels further reported gaps in teachers' understanding, digital competence, assessment practices, and curriculum planning (Arwiyanti et al., 2023; Nursaputri & Sabat, 2023; Sabilah et al., 2023; Tricahyati & Zaim, 2023).

These findings suggest that readiness should not be treated as a stable attribute that teachers either possess or lack. It is produced through organizational arrangements that provide opportunities to interpret policy, observe examples, practise new routines, discuss problems with colleagues, and receive feedback. The organizational perspective matters because isolated training events do not necessarily change classroom practice. The critical question is how professional learning is connected to enactment and how experience in enactment feeds back into subsequent learning.

The case analyzed here is SMA Negeri 8 Padang, a public senior secondary school selected as a Sekolah Penggerak with medium-intensity assistance. The source thesis documented a staged implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum and identified planning, implementation, evaluation, and optimization as school strategies. A prior article based on the same research reported these general strategies (Arassy & Fernandes, 2023). The full thesis corpus, however, contains substantially richer material on teacher development: repeated in-house training (IHT), workshops, webinars, subject-teacher forums (MGMP), a study visit, the presence and recruitment of Guru Penggerak, diagnostic assessment, differentiated learning, digitalization, and school-level reflection.

This unused analytical potential justifies a secondary analysis, not a republication of the earlier paper. The present manuscript changes the unit of analysis from the school's overall implementation strategy to the mechanism through which teacher professional capacity was built and connected to classroom work. Secondary qualitative analysis is appropriate when an existing corpus is revisited with a distinct question and an explicitly differentiated analytic frame, provided the relationship to the prior publication is transparent and no new data are implied (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The study is informed primarily by an organizational-learning interpretation of curriculum implementation. The central analytical proposition is that professional capacity emerges through a cycle linking shared interpretation, professional learning, classroom experimentation, organizational support, and reflection. The functional concepts of adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and pattern maintenance associated with Parsons are used only as a secondary sensitizing framework for locating complementary organizational functions (Ritzer, 2014), not as the principal explanatory theory.

Accordingly, this study asks: How did an Indonesian Merdeka Curriculum pilot school build teacher professional capacity to bridge policy adoption and classroom enactment? The study contributes by specifying the organizational mechanism through which capacity is constructed during curriculum transition, rather than treating readiness as an individual prerequisite or implementation as a checklist of reform activities. More specifically, it identifies an organizational learning pathway in which policy interpretation is converted into classroom capability through repeated professional learning, peer exchange, practice, feedback, and material support.

Method

This study is a qualitative secondary analysis of an archived case-study dataset generated at SMA Negeri 8 Padang in 2023. The original research examined how a Sekolah Penggerak implemented the Merdeka Curriculum through school-level strategies. That corpus previously supported a publication focused on planning, implementation, evaluation, and optimization (Arassy & Fernandes, 2023). The present study asks a different

research question, does not claim new fieldwork, and reanalyzes the thesis corpus specifically for evidence of teacher-capacity development and its connection to classroom enactment.

The full thesis corpus contains data from nine informants: the principal; the vice-principal for curriculum, who was also a member of the school transformation committee; a religious-education teacher who was a Guru Penggerak; a guidance and counselling teacher; two sociology teachers; a librarian; a Japanese-language teacher who was a prospective Guru Penggerak; and a geography teacher who was a Guru Penggerak. This composition provides leadership, teacher, and learning-support perspectives. The prior publication summarized a more compact subset, whereas the present reanalysis returns to the complete documented thesis corpus rather than adding participants retrospectively.

The original study collected data through observation, semi-structured interviews, and documentary materials. The interview guide asked when the school became a pilot school, what difficulties teachers faced, how the school responded, who was involved, and what infrastructure required improvement. Observation focused on school actors, teaching activities, P5, and facilities supporting the new curriculum. Documentary evidence included training records, school implementation documents, schedules, and the observation permit contained in the thesis appendices.

For the secondary analysis, the corpus was read again using a focused coding frame. Initial codes captured (a) uneven early understanding of the reform; (b) socialization and collective interpretation; (c) formal and peer-based professional learning; (d) diagnostic assessment and differentiated instruction; (e) material and digital supports; and (f) evaluation, reflection, and subsequent optimization. Codes were then compared across informants and data sources to develop higher-order categories describing the capacity-building process. The resulting categories were organized chronologically and functionally to identify how one form of organizational activity enabled another.

Analytical credibility was strengthened by comparing interview accounts with observations and documentary dates, and by retaining disconfirming evidence such as uneven teacher understanding and infrastructure constraints rather than presenting implementation as uniformly successful. The analysis does not add member checking, inter-coder agreement, or other procedures that were not documented in the original research. This limitation is stated explicitly in keeping with the requirement to report only procedures actually conducted (Miles et al., 2014).

The source thesis contains an institutional observation/research permit. In this blinded secondary analysis, individual names are replaced by role-based descriptions. The archived thesis does not document individual-consent procedures in enough detail to justify claims beyond the recorded institutional permission; consequently, this manuscript does not retroactively assert procedures that are absent from the source documentation.

Results and Discussion

Policy Adoption Exposed an Uneven Capacity Baseline

The school entered the reform with formal status as a Sekolah Penggerak but without uniform professional readiness. The curriculum transition was staged: Grade 10 began using the Merdeka Curriculum while Grades 11 and 12 still operated under the 2013 Curriculum. This coexistence required teachers and leaders to work across two curricular logics. The school was also classified as receiving medium-intensity assistance, meaning that facilitators and external support remained part of the implementation environment rather than evidence of failure.

Interview and observational data show that early challenges included differences in teachers' understanding of the new curriculum, difficulties with digital technology, and gaps in supporting facilities. The reform therefore did not begin from a homogeneous professional baseline. A teacher who had already participated in transformation programmes could interpret new concepts differently from a colleague encountering them for the first time. This unevenness is consistent with readiness studies showing that curriculum change is experienced differently according to prior knowledge, digital competence, assessment understanding, and professional exposure (Arwiyanti et al., 2023; Nursaputri & Sabat, 2023; Sabilah et al., 2023).

The important finding is not simply that teachers were not ready. Rather, the school treated readiness as something that could be produced. This interpretation shifts analysis from deficit language to organizational mechanism. The school responded to uneven capacity by creating repeated opportunities for sensemaking and professional learning, rather than assuming that a single national guideline would be sufficient to change practice.

Shared Sensemaking Preceded Classroom Change

The first mechanism was collective interpretation. School leaders used socialization and deliberation to explain the reform to teachers, students, and parents. A documented parent socialization session for Phase E students was held on 22 June 2022. This activity had an operational purpose: the school anticipated possible misunderstandings when students encountered different learning arrangements, assessment practices, and

project-based activities. In this sense, socialization was not merely public relations; it helped establish a shared frame for interpreting why school routines were changing.

The data also refer explicitly to changing teachers' mindset. Read literally, this could be reduced to a motivational slogan. Read analytically, it describes a sensemaking problem. Teachers had to move from seeing curriculum as a set of prescribed materials toward using learning outcomes, assessment information, and student differences to make decisions. The school therefore needed a language through which teachers could discuss what the reform expected and how those expectations related to existing routines.

This pattern supports Rahayu et al. (2022), who emphasize collaboration and willingness to change, but the present analysis identifies the mechanism beneath those terms. Collaboration becomes consequential when it produces a sufficiently shared interpretation that allows actors to coordinate. Without such sensemaking, individual teachers may attend the same training yet enact different versions of the reform. In functional terms, integration was achieved through communication before it could be achieved through synchronized classroom practice.

Solehudin et al. (2022) and Sumarsih et al. (2022) describe the Merdeka Curriculum as a reform that requires contextual implementation. The case adds that contextualization begins socially: actors have to translate policy language into locally usable meanings. This is a precondition for professional learning because teachers need to understand what problem a new practice is intended to solve before they can decide how to use it.

A Professional-Learning Architecture, Not a Single Training Event

The second mechanism was the creation of a professional-learning architecture composed of several formats rather than a single event. The thesis documents IHT on 17-18 November 2022, another IHT on 16 August 2023, and an extended P5 IHT from 4-14 July 2022. It also records five workshops, socialization for the second cohort of Sekolah Penggerak on 18-20 July 2022, a webinar on school-level curriculum design on 7-8 July 2022, participation in MGMP, and a study visit to SMA Negeri Tilatang Kamang on 20 September 2022.

These formats performed different functions. IHT localized professional learning because teachers learned with colleagues who shared the same organizational conditions. Workshops and webinars expanded conceptual and procedural knowledge. MGMP connected teachers to subject-specific communities where curriculum ideas could be interpreted through the epistemic demands of particular disciplines. The study visit exposed staff to a school from an earlier Sekolah Penggerak cohort, making implementation visible rather than purely textual.

The vice-principal for curriculum described human-resource development as intensive training and mentoring through workshops, IHT, and study visits. This account indicates that the school did not treat professional development as an administrative requirement. Instead, it assembled multiple opportunities for teachers to encounter the reform repeatedly and in different modes. Such repetition matters because curriculum knowledge is partly explicit, such as understanding official terms, and partly practical, such as seeing how a colleague organizes differentiated tasks.

Dowansiba and Hermanto (2022) identified human-resource strengthening as a central leadership strategy. The present study extends that insight by differentiating the internal functions of professional-learning formats. A workshop may introduce a concept, a study visit may provide a model, and MGMP may enable disciplinary translation. Capacity arises from the relationship among these activities, not simply from their number.

The school also had two Guru Penggerak during the study, while three additional teachers were participating in selection processes. This is analytically important because it increases internal brokerage capacity. External facilitators can introduce reform knowledge, but embedded teacher leaders can continue interpreting and circulating that knowledge after a formal activity ends. Dirgantoro and Soesanto (2023) similarly show that preparing educators for curriculum reform requires more than surface familiarity; teacher-learning systems need actors who can connect institutional expectations with practice.

Professional learning was therefore distributed across external and internal sources. The school used facilitators, supervisors, webinars, other schools, MGMP networks, and teacher leaders. This networked pattern helps explain why implementation should be conceptualized as organizational learning. Knowledge moved across organizational boundaries and was reworked inside the school before being used in classrooms.

Teacher Leadership and Knowledge Brokerage Reduced Dependence on External Training

A further mechanism in the dataset is the emergence of internal knowledge brokers. The school had two Guru Penggerak during the study, while three other teachers were in the selection process. This detail matters because curriculum reform creates a recurring translation problem: external facilitators can introduce concepts, but day-to-day questions arise after formal training has ended. Teacher leaders can shorten the distance between external policy knowledge and local practice by making new ideas discussable in the language of colleagues, subjects, schedules, and actual classrooms.

The role should not be romanticized as an automatic solution. A formal label such as Guru Penggerak does not guarantee that knowledge will circulate, and the archived data do not document a formal coaching system led

by these teachers. What the corpus does show is a growing internal pool of teachers with intensified exposure to reform-oriented professional learning. This created the organizational possibility for knowledge to be retained within the school rather than remaining attached to visiting facilitators. In that sense, teacher leadership functioned less as a position in a hierarchy and more as a potential brokerage resource connecting external programs, subject communities, and school routines.

Knowledge brokerage is especially important because the professional-learning architecture was heterogeneous. IHT addressed school-wide implementation; MGMP connected teachers with subject-specific peers; webinars exposed staff to policy and curriculum guidance; and the study visit provided observable examples from another pilot school. These channels generate different kinds of knowledge. Without brokerage, teachers may receive fragments that remain disconnected. Internal teacher leaders and curriculum coordinators can help combine conceptual guidance with subject-specific interpretation and local constraints, turning a collection of training experiences into a more coherent professional conversation.

This interpretation strengthens the distinction between participation in professional development and transfer from professional development. Attendance records show opportunities to learn, but transfer is visible only when concepts begin to influence decisions. Dirgantoro and Soesanto (2023) show that readiness for the Merdeka Curriculum involves a paradigm shift as well as technical preparation. Rahayu et al. (2022) similarly emphasize collaboration and willingness to change. In the present case, the density of learning channels and the presence of emerging teacher leaders suggest that readiness was being socialized through interaction, not simply accumulated by individual teachers as private expertise.

The implication is a distributed view of curriculum leadership. The principal and vice-principal can authorize time, resources, and priorities, but they cannot personally mediate every pedagogical problem. Subject teachers, Guru Penggerak, and peer communities become important because implementation problems are often highly situated: how to conduct diagnostic assessment in a particular subject, how to design differentiated outputs without lowering expectations, or how to use limited digital equipment with a specific class. Distributed leadership allows such problems to be addressed closer to the point of practice while remaining connected to the school's reform direction.

For capacity building, therefore, schools need more than repeated exposure to external experts. They need mechanisms for retaining and redistributing what is learned. This can include teacher-led sharing after workshops, peer observation, collaborative review of assessment evidence, lesson-design clinics, and short reflective meetings that turn implementation difficulties into collective problems. The thesis does not document all of these routines, so they are offered as implications rather than observed facts. The empirical contribution is narrower but important: the school combined external support with a growing internal leadership base, creating conditions under which professional knowledge could become an organizational resource rather than a temporary training experience.

Diagnostic Assessment Connected Professional Knowledge to Classroom Decisions

The third mechanism was translation into practice, most clearly visible in diagnostic assessment. The source data report that the school conducted diagnostic assessment at the beginning, middle, and end of learning periods. Teachers used the results to identify students' characteristics, strengths, and difficulties and to plan subsequent media and instructional methods. This practice created a concrete bridge between reform discourse and classroom decision-making.

Diagnostic assessment matters because it changes the object of teacher attention. Instead of beginning only with the sequence of content, teachers are expected to begin with information about learners. This expectation increases professional judgment: teachers have to interpret evidence and decide what to vary. Rosidah et al. (2021) argue that authentic assessment requires capacities spanning preparation, implementation, analysis, and reporting, while Naufalin et al. (2023) demonstrate that teacher readiness for assessment is shaped by multiple professional factors. The case shows how assessment information can become the hinge between professional learning and differentiated instruction.

The thesis reports that intraclass learning used differentiated approaches and allowed variation in learning media and in the form of student work. The important point is not whether every classroom achieved an ideal model of differentiation. The evidence does not support such a universal claim. Rather, teachers were beginning to use student information to justify variation in learning processes and outputs. This is a more defensible indication of curricular enactment than simply noting that lesson plans contained new terminology.

Tricahyati and Zaim (2023) and Asmahasanah et al. (2023) show that teachers often face difficulty translating reform language into classroom design. The present finding specifies one translation pathway: professional learning introduces the rationale for responsive teaching; diagnostic assessment produces local evidence; teachers then use that evidence to select media, methods, or tasks. When this sequence occurs, training is more likely to influence students' learning experiences.

P5 provided a parallel site of enactment. The school implemented projects on local wisdom, sustainable lifestyles, and anti-bullying in a block system. Rachmawati et al. (2022) and Septiani et al. (2022) describe P5 as a distinctive component of the reform that requires project planning and cross-curricular coordination. In the present case, P5 intensified the need for teachers to collaborate outside conventional subject boundaries, thereby making professional capacity an organizational rather than purely individual property.

Infrastructure Was a Condition of Capacity, Not a Separate Technical Issue

The fourth mechanism concerned material and digital conditions. The thesis identifies limited projectors, internet access, Merdeka Curriculum learning materials, and literacy spaces as constraints that required improvement. The school used performance-based operational funding to procure supporting resources, with the source thesis recording an allocation of approximately IDR 90 million for school-support needs during the relevant academic year.

This evidence prevents an overly individualistic interpretation of teacher capacity. A teacher can understand digital learning but remain unable to enact it consistently when connectivity or presentation equipment is unavailable. Conversely, equipment alone does not produce pedagogical change if teachers lack knowledge of how to use it. Capacity is therefore relational: it emerges from an interaction between professional competence and organizational conditions.

Hasibuan et al. (2022) and Fauzi (2022) similarly describe infrastructure and adaptation as implementation issues in pilot schools. The present analysis locates infrastructure inside the capacity cycle. Material support converts professional possibilities into feasible routines. It also influences whether innovations survive beyond demonstration lessons or training sessions.

Evaluation Turned Experience into New Professional-Learning Needs

The fifth mechanism was evaluation and reflection. The school documented reflection and reporting to the Ministry of Education as part of its accountability for implementation and the use of support funds. More importantly for this analysis, evaluation created information about problems that had not been solved by initial training. Difficulties in learning outcomes, technology use, or implementation could be fed back into subsequent planning and professional development.

This feedback relationship changes how the four strategies identified in the original study should be interpreted. Planning, implementation, evaluation, and optimization are not merely consecutive stages. Optimization produces new resources and knowledge that shape the next round of planning; implementation generates problems that become objects of reflection; evaluation identifies capacity gaps; and new professional learning addresses those gaps. The process is cyclical rather than linear.

Yaelasari and Astuti (2022) show that curriculum implementation changes how students learn across subjects, while the present analysis draws attention to the organizational work that makes such change possible. Classroom innovation is preceded by meetings, training, data interpretation, peer exchange, procurement, and reflection. These backstage processes are easy to omit when evaluation concentrates only on whether a curriculum has been formally implemented.

The cycle also clarifies the relevance of the functional framework. Adaptation appears in the school's response to new curriculum demands and technology; goal attainment appears in the explicit effort to improve learning quality and student competence; integration is visible in deliberation, MGMP, P5 collaboration, and teacher leadership; and pattern maintenance is visible when professional learning and reflection become repeatable routines rather than temporary responses. Ritzer's (2014) discussion of Parsons is useful here as a way of locating complementary organizational functions without treating the school as a perfectly integrated system.

Table 1. Teacher-capacity cycle during the Merdeka Curriculum transition

Capacity process	Empirical evidence in the thesis corpus	Function in curriculum enactment
Shared sensemaking	Teacher and parent socialization; school deliberation; attention to mindset	Builds a common interpretation of why routines are changing
Professional learning	IHT, five workshops, webinar, MGMP, study visit, Guru Penggerak	Expands conceptual, procedural, and peer-based knowledge
Translation to practice	Diagnostic assessment; differentiated media, methods, and student outputs; P5	Connects reform knowledge to classroom decisions
Organizational enablement	Internet, projectors, learning resources, literacy space	Makes new practices feasible and repeatable
Reflection and renewal	Evaluation, reporting, reflection, subsequent optimization	Turns implementation experience into new learning needs

Source: Authors' analysis.

Discussion

The Capacity-Practice-Reflection Cycle as the Study Contribution

Table 1 synthesizes the mechanism that answers the research question. The school did not build teacher capacity through training alone. Capacity was produced when professional learning was connected to local interpretation, classroom evidence, enabling resources, and reflection. This finding refines a common implementation narrative in which teacher readiness is listed alongside infrastructure, leadership, and policy as separate variables. In this case, those elements interacted to produce readiness over time.

The contribution is therefore a process model: shared sensemaking creates a basis for collective action; professional-learning activities expand available knowledge; diagnostic assessment and experimentation translate knowledge into practice; infrastructure reduces practical barriers; and evaluation makes practice available for further learning. The sequence is not deterministic, and the evidence includes continuing gaps. Its value lies in showing how organizational activities can become mutually reinforcing.

This interpretation extends the early Indonesian literature. Angga et al. (2022), Rahayu et al. (2022), and Sumarsih et al. (2022) identify broad differences and implementation patterns; Dowansiba and Hermanto (2022) emphasize leadership strategy; readiness studies identify individual and institutional gaps. The present analysis links these strands by showing how leadership, professional development, assessment, collaboration, and infrastructure can be organized into a capacity-building cycle.

For policy and practice, the implication is that professional development should be evaluated by transfer rather than attendance. A school can record many training events without changing classroom practice. More meaningful indicators include whether teachers can use assessment information, whether they discuss evidence with colleagues, whether they can adapt media and tasks, whether teacher leaders broker knowledge across groups, and whether implementation problems become topics for subsequent professional learning.

The analysis also suggests caution about rapid comparisons between schools. Schools enter reform with different professional histories and material conditions. A school receiving medium-intensity assistance may be in an earlier learning phase than a school with stronger internal expertise. Evaluation should therefore examine the quality of the learning cycle, not simply the speed with which formal components appear in documents.

Limitations

This study has four limitations. First, it is a secondary analysis of one school and cannot establish how common the identified cycle is across Indonesia. Second, the source dataset was designed to investigate general implementation strategies rather than professional learning specifically; some potentially relevant details, such as the content and follow-up of every training session, were therefore not collected systematically. Third, the thesis does not provide direct longitudinal observations linking particular training events to measured changes in teaching quality. The manuscript consequently interprets a plausible organizational process without claiming causal effects on student outcomes. Fourth, the archived methodology does not document member checking or an independent coding audit, so the present analysis relies on triangulation across the available interviews, observations, and documents.

Conclusion

The study asked how a Merdeka Curriculum pilot school built teacher professional capacity to bridge policy adoption and classroom enactment. The secondary analysis identifies a five-part cycle: shared sensemaking, multi-format professional learning, translation through diagnostic assessment and differentiated practice, organizational enablement through infrastructure, and reflection that generates new learning needs.

The central contribution is conceptual as well as empirical. Teacher readiness is not only a precondition of curriculum change; it can be an organizational outcome of well-connected learning processes. This reframing helps explain why training has limited value when disconnected from classroom evidence, peer exchange, resources, and reflection, and why schools require continuing professional-learning infrastructures during reform.

For schools, the practical implication is to design professional development as a cycle in which teachers interpret, try, examine, discuss, and revise. For policy makers, support for curriculum reform should include protected collaborative time, subject-based communities, access to experienced peer schools, and resources that allow professional knowledge to be enacted. Future comparative research should test whether similar capacity-practice-reflection cycles appear across schools with different assistance categories, resource levels, and student populations.

Declarations

Author contribution

Author 1: developed the main research idea and objectives, designed the research methodology, conducted data collection and investigation, performed the data analysis, and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. Author 2: contributed to the development and implementation of the research methodology, supported the data collection and investigation process, and reviewed and revised the manuscript to improve its academic quality, clarity, and structure, provided input into the research concept and direction, supervised and guided the overall research process, reviewed and improved the manuscript, and contributed to obtaining financial support or research funding

Funding

The research received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest related to the publication of this article.

Use of generative AI

Generative AI were used solely for translation and language editing of the manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for the content and accuracy of the article.

Acknowledgments

Authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all parties who contributed to and supported the completion of this study. Their valuable assistance, support, and encouragement are greatly appreciated.

References

- Angga, A., Suryana, C., Nurwahidah, I., Hernawan, A. H., & Prihantini. (2022). Komparasi implementasi Kurikulum 2013 dan Kurikulum Merdeka di sekolah dasar Kabupaten Garut. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(4), 5877–5889. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i4.3149>
- Arassy, D. F., & Fernandes, R. (2023). Strategi Sekolah Penggerak dalam mengimplementasikan Kurikulum Merdeka di SMA Negeri 8 Padang. *Naradidik: Journal of Education & Pedagogy*, 2(4), 281–290. <https://doi.org/10.24036/nara.v2i4.158>
- Arwiyanti, A., Fathurohman, I., & Safitri, A. (2023). Kesiapan guru sekolah dasar terhadap implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(6), 10383–10392. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i6.4405>
- Asmahasanah, S., Chairunnissa, I. C., & Hakim, N. (2023). Navigating Merdeka Curriculum in first grade: Teacher challenges and strategies. *Journal of Integrated Elementary Education*, 3(2), 137–149. <https://doi.org/10.21580/jieed.v3i2.17592>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Dirgantoro, K. P. S., & Soesanto, R. H. (2023). Towards a paradigm shift: Analysis of student teachers' and teacher education institutions' readiness on Kurikulum Merdeka. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 8(2), 185–201. <https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v8i2.4271>
- Dowansiba, N., & Hermanto, H. (2022). Strategi kepala sekolah menengah atas dalam menyiapkan Sekolah Penggerak. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 7(2), 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v7i2.3060>
- Fauzi, A. (2022). Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka di Sekolah Penggerak. *Pahlawan: Jurnal Pendidikan-Sosial-Budaya*, 18(2), 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.57216/pah.v18i2.480>
- Hasibuan, A. R. H., Aufa, A., Khairunnisa, L., Siregar, W. A., & Adha, H. (2022). Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka di Sekolah Penggerak SDN 104231 Sugiharjo Kecamatan Batang Kuis. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 4(6), 7411–7419. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jpdv.v4i6.9513>
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2022). Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia Nomor 56/M/2022 tentang Pedoman Penerapan Kurikulum dalam Rangka Pemulihan Pembelajaran.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Naufalin, L. R., Anggraeni, A. I., Krisnaresanti, A., & Janah, M. (2023). Factors influencing teacher readiness in implementing authentic assessment of Merdeka Belajar Curriculum. *Dinamika Pendidikan*, 18(2), 206–219. <https://doi.org/10.15294/dp.v18i2.46968>

- Nursaputri, R., & Sabat, Y. (2023). Kindergarten teachers' readiness in implementing Kurikulum Merdeka. *Academy of Education Journal*, 14(2), 531–544. <https://doi.org/10.47200/aoej.v14i2.1715>
- Rachmawati, N., Marini, A., Nafiah, M., & Nurasiah, I. (2022). Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila dalam implementasi Kurikulum Prototipe di sekolah penggerak jenjang sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(3), 3613–3625. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.2714>
- Rahayu, R., Rosita, R., Rahayuningsih, Y. S., Hernawan, A. H., & Prihantini. (2022). Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar di Sekolah Penggerak. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(4), 6313–6319. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i4.3237>
- Ritzer, G. (2014). Teori sosiologi modern. Kencana.
- Rosidah, C. T., Pramulia, P., & Susiloningsih, W. (2021). Analisis kesiapan guru mengimplementasikan asesmen autentik dalam Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, 12(1), 87–103. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jpd.v12i01.21159>
- Sabilah, I., Umar, U., & Erliana, Y. D. (2023). Analisis tingkat kesiapan guru dalam mengimplementasikan Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar di sekolah dasar. *Ainara Journal*, 4(3), 210–215. <https://doi.org/10.54371/ainj.v4i3.311>
- Septiani, A., Novaliyosi, & Nindiasari, H. (2022). Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka ditinjau dari pembelajaran matematika dan pelaksanaan Projek Profil Pelajar Pancasila. *AKSIOMA: Jurnal Matematika dan Pendidikan Matematika*, 13(3), 421–435. <https://doi.org/10.26877/aks.v13i3.14211>
- Solehudin, D., Priatna, T., & Zaqiyah, Q. Y. (2022). Konsep implementasi Kurikulum Prototipe. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(4), 7486–7495. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i4.3510>
- Sumarsih, I., Marliyani, T., Hadiyansah, Y., Hernawan, A. H., & Prihantini. (2022). Analisis implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka di Sekolah Penggerak sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(5), 8248–8258. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i5.3216>
- Tricahyati, S., & Zaim, M. (2023). English teachers' readiness in implementation of Merdeka Belajar Curriculum in teaching English at junior high school. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(1), 97–105. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v12i1.121783>
- Yaelasari, M., & Astuti, V. Y. (2022). Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka pada cara belajar siswa untuk semua mata pelajaran: Studi kasus pembelajaran tatap muka di SMK INFOKOM Bogor. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 3(7), 584–591. <https://doi.org/10.36418/japendi.v3i7.1041>