Volume 4 Number 2 (2026)
July-December 2026
Page: 1420-1435

EDUJAVARE: International Journal of Educational Research
ISSN: 3031-2884
https://edujavare.com/index.php/edujavare
DOI: 10.70610/edujavare.v4i02.1989

Reading Comprehension Learning Based On Barrets Taxonomy In Grade Ix Of SMPN 1 Karanggeneng

Kustina Elisah[1], Anisa Ulfah[2], Laila Tri Lestari[3]
[123] Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan, Indonesia; kustina.2022@mhs.unisda.ac.id; anisaulfah@unisda.ac.id; lailatri@unisda.ac.id

* WhatsApp Number

Article history Submitted: 2026/08/19; Revised: 2026/08/22; Accepted: 2026/08/25;

Abstract

This study aims to describe the reading comprehension learning process and the characteristics of students' reading abilities in class IX.B SMPN 1 Karanggeneng based on the five levels of Barrett Taxonomy, namely literal, reorganization, inferential, evaluative, and appreciative. The research employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study design. The subjects were students of class IX.B selected through purposive sampling. Research data included learning planning (teaching modules), learning process (documentation videos and field notes), and learning outcomes (student-made test items and peer assessment results). Data analysis was conducted through four stages: data collection, data condensation, data presentation, and conclusion drawing and verification. The findings revealed that reading comprehension learning was implemented in sequential stages, starting from orientation, material delivery, example provision, text construction, question development, to joint summary. Test item analysis showed dominance of literal comprehension level with 250 items out of 330 total items, followed by reorganization with 52 items and inference with 28 items, while evaluative and appreciative levels were not found. Peer assessment results demonstrated variation in student achievement with the highest score of 100, middle score of 92, and lowest score of 86. The implication of this study indicates that reading comprehension learning requires a gradual approach starting from strengthening foundational understanding, but the depth of students' cognitive engagement still needs to be enhanced to better align with inquiry-based and active learning approaches that demand higher-order reasoning, particularly at evaluative and appreciative levels

Keywords Reading Comprehension, Barrett Taxonomy, Observation Report Text

INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension is one of the basic competencies that students must possess to support the success of the learning process. Reading activities are not only aimed at obtaining information but also involve the processes of understanding, interpreting, evaluating, and

constructing meaning based on the information conveyed by the author. Tarigan (2015) explains that reading is a process undertaken by readers to obtain the message intended by the author through written language (Seliro Wangi et al., 2022). This definition indicates that successful reading is not measured by the ability to pronounce words fluently, but rather by the ability to understand the content of a text comprehensively. The better the students' reading comprehension skills, the greater their opportunities to develop critical thinking skills, solve problems, and connect various pieces of information obtained during the learning process.

The problem of reading ability in Indonesia remains a concern in various educational studies. The results of the 2022 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) indicate that Indonesian students' reading ability remains below the average of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) member countries. Data published by the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (2024) also show that Indonesia ranked sixth in Southeast Asia with a reading score of 359. This achievement remains below Singapore, Vietnam, Brunei Darussalam, and Malaysia. These results indicate that many students still experience difficulties in understanding explicit and implicit information, integrating various pieces of information, and critically evaluating the content of texts. This condition suggests that reading instruction in schools still requires further development to improve students' quality of understanding of various types of texts.

The evaluation of reading instruction is one of the aspects that determines teachers' success in mapping students' abilities. Himawan (2023) argues that reading assessment instruments used in schools are still predominantly composed of questions that measure students' ability to locate information directly from texts. Such forms of evaluation are not yet capable of describing students' abilities to organize information, draw inferences, evaluate the content of reading materials, or appreciate texts. Consequently, the evaluation results obtained by teachers tend to indicate the level of success in answering questions rather than providing information about the characteristics of students' reading abilities at each level of comprehension. This condition demonstrates that the quality of assessment instruments plays an important role in obtaining a more comprehensive picture of reading ability.

Barrett's Taxonomy is one framework specifically developed to identify reading comprehension abilities. Unlike Bloom's Taxonomy, which examines thinking abilities in general, Barrett's Taxonomy classifies reading abilities into five levels: literal comprehension, reorganization, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation.

The application of Barrett's Taxonomy in reading research has been widely conducted by previous researchers, with most studies focusing on the development of assessment instruments, the effectiveness of learning models, or the improvement of reading learning outcomes through quantitative approaches, which generally provide information about the level of reading achievement based on test scores or percentages (Himawan, 2023). Such information does provide an overview of students' achievement levels; however, it has not been able to explain the characteristics of reading abilities at each level of Barrett's Taxonomy in depth, particularly research employing a qualitative approach to describe how students understand

texts, process information, draw inferences, evaluate reading content, and appreciate texts. Such studies remain relatively limited at the junior secondary school level. This limitation indicates a research gap that needs to be further investigated in order to obtain a more comprehensive picture of students' reading abilities based on each level of Barrett's Taxonomy.

The results of preliminary observations at SMP Negeri 1 Karanggeneng indicate that the reading learning process has implemented student-centered activities through the use of the peer assessment method. Nevertheless, the reading abilities demonstrated by students have not developed evenly across all levels of comprehension. Most students are able to answer questions related to explicit information in texts, but they still experience difficulties when faced with questions requiring the ability to organize information, draw conclusions, evaluate the content of reading materials, or provide responses to texts. This condition indicates that the learning process that has been implemented has not fully provided a clear picture of the characteristics of students' reading abilities based on each level of Barrett's Taxonomy. Information regarding these characteristics is needed as a basis for designing learning strategies and evaluation methods that are more appropriate to students' needs.

This study aims to describe the reading comprehension learning process and the characteristics of the reading abilities of Class IX.B students at SMP Negeri 1 Karanggeneng based on the five levels of Barrett's Taxonomy, namely literal, reorganization, inferential, evaluative, and appreciative comprehension. The results of this study are expected to contribute to the development of reading comprehension studies, particularly those related to the application of Barrett's Taxonomy in the context of Indonesian language learning. The findings are also expected to serve as a consideration for teachers in designing learning activities and assessment instruments capable of measuring students' reading abilities more comprehensively in accordance with the characteristics of each level of comprehension.

METHODS

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study design. This approach was selected because the study aimed to describe in depth the characteristics of students' reading comprehension abilities at each level of Barrett's Taxonomy. The research subjects were Class IX.B students at SMPN 1 Karanggeneng, who were selected purposively by considering their involvement in the reading comprehension learning process. The research data included planning (teaching modules), the learning process (video documentation during learning activities and field notes), and learning outcomes (student-created questions and peer assessment results) related to students' reading comprehension. This study also used secondary data in the form of findings from relevant previous studies. Data analysis consisted of four stages: data collection, data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification (Darmalaksana, 2020, as cited in Ulfah et al., 2022).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the study on reading comprehension learning based on Barrett's Taxonomy among ninth-grade students at SMPN 1 Karanggeneng, the findings are presented according to the research focus, which includes lesson planning, the implementation of learning activities, and students' reading comprehension outcomes at each level of Barrett's Taxonomy.

A. Lesson Planning

Reading comprehension planning based on Barrett's Taxonomy was designed to provide students with opportunities to participate in learning activities more actively and systematically. Through this approach, students were expected to gain meaningful learning experiences through five systematic cognitive levels: literal comprehension, reorganization, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. The planning consisted of five components of the teaching module: (1) learning outcomes, (2) learning objectives, (3) learning materials, (4) learning activities, and (5) peer assessment. These components were adapted from the teaching module prepared by the teacher for reading comprehension instruction. They served as a basis for document analysis so that the research could be conducted systematically, beginning with the initial learning outcomes or objectives and continuing through the evaluation of learning (Muhadi et al., 2025). The findings are described as follows.

The first planning component was the learning outcomes. The findings showed that LO1 and LO3 were categorized as literal comprehension (TB1). The second component was the learning objectives. LO1 was associated with TB1 and TB2, while LO2 and LO3 were categorized as TB1. The third component was the learning materials, consisting of the definition and structure of LHO texts, analysis of LHO text structures, and examples of LHO texts. The definition and structure of LHO texts and the examples of LHO texts were categorized as TB1, while the analysis of LHO text structures was categorized as TB2. The fourth component was learning activities, which consisted of introduction, core, and closing activities in the first and second meetings. The first meeting included activities categorized as TB1 and TB2, whereas the second meeting involved TB1, TB2, TB3, and TB4. The fifth component was assessment, which applied peer assessment through a question-and-answer system after reading and listening. Students prepared ten questions and conducted the activity three times with different students. This process involved TB1 and TB2. The assessment team then provided scores based on the teacher's instructions, with the assessment divided into accuracy and speed, which was categorized as TB4.

1. Learning Outcomes

The findings showed that literal comprehension (TB1) dominated the formulation of the learning outcomes prepared by the teacher. This finding is consistent with Adetya (2015), who found that students' comprehension of LHO texts still focused on identifying explicit information. In contrast, their abilities to draw conclusions, identify main ideas, and interpret implicit information remained low. This condition is related to the teacher's efforts to prioritize reading skills as an anticipation of declining reading ability and interest among students.

Tillah (2020) also found that students' ability to analyze and interpret LHO texts based on their structure, linguistic elements, and content was categorized as moderate, with a mean score of 66.67. This result indicates that students still experienced difficulties in understanding implicit meanings. This finding reinforces the analysis of LO1 and LO2, indicating that LHO text learning still focused on literal comprehension, while interpretive and evaluative abilities had not developed optimally.

The finding in LO3, namely the activity of "writing answers based on factual information," was categorized as literal comprehension. This result is consistent with Ajijan et al. (2018), who found that in the early stages of learning, students tended to copy the structure and facts from model texts, resulting in reproductive writing. After participating in learning using a discovery approach, students' abilities improved because they began constructing texts based on their own observations. Thus, factual writing activities remain at the literal level and only develop toward higher levels when students are required to process data and construct their own arguments.

The activity of rewriting facts indicates that students' cognitive processes were still limited to remembering and copying information. Students were not yet required to select, compare, or evaluate information, and therefore their higher-order thinking abilities had not yet developed. Meanwhile, LO2, namely the activity of "asking questions orally," was not included as an indicator of the taxonomy because it demonstrated language skills more than the cognitive processes involved in reading. This finding differs from Rosida and Intiana (2023), who stated that asking questions and discussing observation results can encourage students to identify information gaps, predict answers, and reflect on aspects they do not yet understand. Therefore, questioning activities have the potential to develop interpretive and evaluative abilities when appropriately designed.

2. Learning Objectives

The first learning objective directed students to listen to texts orally with their partners in turns. One student read the text while the other listened to the information presented. This activity trained students' attention, memory, and comprehension in processing information individually. Listening is an active process involving attention, short-term memory, and meaning processing (Pratiwi et al., 2025). The use of different texts according to the theme also provided varied learning experiences and encouraged cooperation among students. This is consistent with Ulfah et al. (2022), who stated that Merdeka Belajar-oriented learning is not only focused on learning outcomes but also on learning experiences and the development of positive values.

The second learning objective directed students to identify factual information in the text as a basis for independently developing questions or texts. This activity trained students to find, process, and reorganize information. This finding is consistent with Arnawa (2021), who stated that text-based learning can develop students' abilities to identify information and formulate questions.

The third learning objective directed students to answer questions based on the information they had listened to. This activity helped students recall, discuss, and clarify information with their partners before formulating conclusions. This finding is consistent with Nurhidayati (2013), who explained that discussions and question-and-answer activities after listening can help students express their understanding, exchange ideas, and formulate conclusions based on the text.

3. Learning Materials

The first material component was categorized as literal comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB1) because the material presented basic knowledge and explicit information that helped students identify facts. This is consistent with Himawan (2023), who stated that literal comprehension includes the ability to understand main ideas and information stated directly in a reading text.

The second material component was categorized as reorganization (TB2) because the material presented examples of LHO texts along with their structures and analyses. This presentation helped students connect concepts with examples and classify paragraphs according to their structures. This finding is consistent with Munaf (2023), who explained that reorganization requires students to analyze, organize, and classify explicit information. Before completing the assignment, students were also provided with examples of linguistic and structural questions related to LHO texts along with explanations. The presentation of examples and explanations helped students understand the relationship between concepts and their independent application (Suttrisno et al., 2022).

The third material component was categorized as literal comprehension (TB1) because the material served to provide initial understanding before students completed the assignment. The information presented consisted of main ideas and explicit explanations, which corresponded to the characteristics of literal comprehension (Himawan, 2023).

The fourth material component was not included in any level of Barrett's Taxonomy. In this section, students were instructed to compose a 300-word LHO text on the theme of a beach and create ten questions consisting of two structural questions, three linguistic questions, and five content-related questions. These activities supported reading and writing skills but did not directly measure reading comprehension abilities (Cahyarani & Priyatni, 2023).

4. Learning Activities

This subsection is described in greater detail because the learning activities were implemented over two meetings. Therefore, the findings and discussion are divided into two parts.

a. First Meeting

Based on the analysis, the LHO text learning activities consisted of introduction, core, and closing activities. During the introduction, the teacher invited students to pray, checked attendance, and prepared the classroom. However, the lesson plan did not include stimulating questions that could connect students' prior experiences with the LHO text material. Such questions are important for encouraging students to think, develop ideas, stimulate curiosity,

and activate prior knowledge (Kemendikdasmen, 2025). The introductory activities were not included in any level of Barrett's Taxonomy because they functioned only as learning orientation and did not yet involve students in understanding or processing information from the reading text (Munaf, 2023).

The core activities included an explanation of the material and examples of LHO texts, the preparation of texts based on a predetermined theme, and the development of ten questions based on the texts that had been prepared. The teacher used the beach as the object because it was considered close to students' experiences and could therefore help them construct understanding through direct experience and reflection (Anggreni, 2020). The explanation of the definition, structure, and characteristics of LHO texts was categorized as literal comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB1) because students understood the textual information directly. This material served as a foundation before students completed more complex tasks (Deviana, 2018).

The activity of composing an LHO text based on a predetermined theme and title was not included in Barrett's Taxonomy because it focused more on writing skills and text construction. Students were required to organize reports based on observations in a structured and logical manner and in accordance with writing conventions (Rosida & Intiana, 2023). Meanwhile, the activity of creating ten questions based on the text was categorized as reorganization in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB2) because students needed to identify, classify, and reorganize information from the text. Reorganization refers to the ability to rearrange information so that understanding becomes more structured (Himawan, 2023).

The closing activity was conducted through the teacher and students jointly drawing conclusions from the learning process. This activity was not included in any level of Barrett's Taxonomy because the conclusions concerned the overall learning process rather than the reorganization of information based on the content of the text. Thus, the LHO text learning plan was organized gradually, beginning with conceptual understanding, text construction, information processing, and concluding the learning process. However, the application of Barrett's Taxonomy remained limited to literal comprehension and reorganization.

b. Second Meeting

During the introductory activity, the teacher opened the class and divided students into groups or pairs. Although this activity was not included in any level of Barrett's Taxonomy, the grouping of students demonstrated an effort to implement collaborative learning. Organizing students in pairs and providing initial instructions could help students prepare for the learning process and create an active and well-directed learning environment (Shulhan, 2026).

The core activities were conducted in pairs and in rotation. Students read the LHO texts they had created during the previous meeting, while their partners listened without looking at the texts. Afterward, the students who read the texts asked questions based on their content, while the listening students answered according to the information they had understood.

Reading aloud and listening in pairs could train reading fluency, confidence in conveying information, concentration, and student engagement in understanding texts (Dewi et al., 2025).

The reading and listening activities were categorized as literal comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB1) because students were directed to understand explicit information in the text without engaging in deep interpretation (Himawan, 2023). The activities of asking and answering questions based on the text were categorized as reorganization (TB2) because students needed to identify, recall, and classify the information obtained while listening. Furthermore, the activity of checking the accuracy of a partner's answers could lead to inferential comprehension (TB3) because students analyzed the answers and compared them with information or predictions based on the text (Munaf, 2023).

These activities were conducted in rotation with different partners three times. Rotating partners could provide more equal learning experiences and help produce more objective assessments (Shulhan, 2026). However, implementation required sufficient time and effective classroom management to ensure that all stages could be conducted effectively. Thus, the core activities demonstrated the implementation of collaborative learning involving literal comprehension, reorganization, and inferential comprehension.

The closing activity was conducted through teacher feedback on the learning process. This activity was categorized as evaluation in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB4) because it helped students assess their progress, strengths, and difficulties experienced during learning (Barrett, 1968, as cited in Munaf, 2023). Feedback that was aligned with the learning objectives could help students understand their current learning position and determine steps for improvement (Sarifah & Hanif, 2025). In addition, feedback results could be used by teachers to evaluate instruction and plan improvements for subsequent meetings (Azani, 2024).

5. Assessment Instrument

The assessment instrument demonstrated the implementation of peer assessment, which required students to understand how to assess their partners through a collaborative system. This is supported by Adawiyah (2023), who explained that peer assessment is highly suitable for reading comprehension tasks, summaries, text analysis, and responsive writing because students learn to recognize criteria for text quality. The assessment process was conducted after reading and listening. Therefore, the first finding was categorized as literal comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB1) because students engaged in reading and listening activities to capture explicit information. It was also categorized as reorganization (TB2), as demonstrated by students' activities of asking questions and exercising their memory based on what they had listened to. At this level, readers enter a stage of analyzing, organizing, and synthesizing explicit ideas in the form of classification, summaries, synthesis, and outlines (Himawan, 2023).

In the second finding, students were directed to assess their peers' answers. This activity was categorized as the evaluation level of Barrett's Taxonomy because students were required to assess the accuracy of answers by comparing them with information in the text. This process required carefulness and critical thinking because a partner's answer did not always

correspond to the reader's prediction (Fauzi & Al-Zainuri, 2024). Therefore, readers needed to recheck the information in the text, compare it with their partner's answer, and provide an assessment based on predetermined criteria consistent with the characteristics of evaluation in Barrett's Taxonomy (Munaf, 2023).

In the third finding, the assessment was conducted in rotation, with each student having the opportunity to become both the reader, as the assessor, and the listener, as the assessed student. Thus, the assessment was considered objective because it was conducted by three assessment teams and the results were then averaged. However, this finding was not included in any level of Barrett's Taxonomy because it represented a procedure for implementing the assessment. Based on the discussion, the implementation of peer assessment in reading and listening instruction can develop students' abilities at the literal, reorganization, and evaluation levels of Barrett's Taxonomy through activities involving reading, asking questions, checking answers, and assessing peers in rotation. Assessment by several students, followed by calculation of the average score, can further support the objectivity of the assessment results

A. Implementation of Reading Comprehension Learning

This section describes the implementation process of reading comprehension learning, including the planning stage, implementation of core learning activities, and evaluation of learning outcomes. Therefore, the results and discussion are divided into two parts: (a) First Meeting and (b) Second Meeting.

a. First Meeting

Based on the findings, the introductory activity began with greetings, prayer, attendance checking, and motivation. The teacher then asked stimulating questions about LHO texts, such as students' experiences of visiting beaches and their characteristics. These activities established students' readiness, motivation, and a conducive learning environment before entering the core material. Initial activities, discipline, and learning motivation have been found to be related to student achievement (Adinoto, 2019). Meanwhile, apperception and motivation can improve conceptual understanding and learning motivation (Rahman, 2021). Stimulating questions also function to connect students' prior experiences with the material to be learned (Anggreni, 2020).

The implementation of the introductory activities was generally consistent with the lesson plan, although the stimulating questions had not been included in the original learning design. Nevertheless, this finding demonstrates the importance of stimulating questions in activating prior knowledge and directing students' attention before the core learning activities.

The core activity began by reviewing the LHO text material that had been provided through a website one day earlier. This activity was categorized as literal comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB1) because students recalled and received explicit information from the material they had previously studied (Rahma, 2020). The use of websites can increase students' interest, engagement, and learning outcomes (Haholongan et al., 2024). However, providing the material one day before the lesson had not been included in the lesson plan. This

difference demonstrates an adjustment between the planned and actual learning processes, as learning implementation needs to adapt to students' responses, available time, and classroom conditions (Anwar et al., 2023).

Students were then directed to compose LHO texts on the theme of beaches by utilizing various references or keywords and subsequently create ten questions according to the teacher's requirements. This activity was categorized as reorganization in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB2) because students selected, processed, and reorganized information into texts and questions (Agustriani & Nurjamin, 2026). However, the use of digital sources needs to be supervised because students may potentially use artificial intelligence, resulting in texts that are not entirely their own work. In addition, students were also asked to prepare answers, even though the initial plan only included the preparation of questions. Thus, the implementation of the activity differed slightly from the lesson plan while still providing students with opportunities to verify the accuracy of information.

The closing activity was conducted through reflection between the teacher and students, followed by information regarding the activities planned for the next meeting. This activity was categorized as evaluative comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB4) because students were encouraged to assess their learning experiences and understanding and identify aspects that still needed improvement (Azani, 2024). The reminder about the next activity also served as a follow-up measure to help students prepare themselves. In addition, the reflection results could help the teacher identify the strengths and weaknesses of the learning process as a basis for improvement in the following meeting (Dolong, 2016).

b. Second Meeting

During the introductory activity of the second meeting, the teacher opened the lesson with greetings and prayer and then instructed students to arrange their seats according to their assigned pairs. This activity aimed to create an orderly classroom environment while preparing students to participate in collaborative learning. Arranging students in pairs encouraged interaction and cooperation among students (Shulhan, 2026). In text-based language learning, such an arrangement also supports student engagement through reading, listening, discussion, and collaborative task completion (Kholiq & Luthfiyati, 2020).

The core activity was conducted through paired reading aloud, listening, answering questions, and assessing partners' answers. These activities were carried out in three rotations so that every student had the opportunity to become a reader, listener, and assessor. Reading and listening activities were categorized as literal comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB1) because students identified explicit information in the text. The paired reading strategy also positioned students alternately as readers and listeners in the process of understanding the text (Adetya, 2015). However, simultaneous reading activities could create a noisy classroom atmosphere, requiring students to maintain concentration while listening to their partners' reading.

Assessing a partner's answers was categorized as inferential comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB3) because students needed to consider the accuracy of the answers based on

the content of the text and predetermined criteria. Nevertheless, students sometimes tended to consider their partners' answers correct, making assessment objectivity a challenge. Therefore, teachers need to clearly explain the assessment criteria, provide practice, and supervise students so that their assessments are based on the answers rather than their personal relationships with their partners (Alifah et al., 2025).

The three-round rotation was categorized as evaluative comprehension in Barrett's Taxonomy (TB4) because students had opportunities to assess the process and results of their partners' work alternately. This activity provided students with experiences in reading, listening, collaborating, and evaluating. However, its implementation required adjustment because students had previously been more accustomed to lecture-based learning. Thus, peer assessment learning represents an innovation that can increase student engagement and evaluative abilities, but it still requires teacher guidance and supervision to ensure that the process remains objective and well-directed (Agustriani & Nurjamin, 2026).

The closing activity was conducted briefly through classroom closure and prayer because the learning time had ended. This activity was not included in any level of Barrett's Taxonomy and did not correspond to the original plan, which was supposed to include reflection, conclusion drawing, and follow-up activities. The failure to implement these activities was primarily caused by limited time. Therefore, teachers need to manage time more effectively so that closing activities can still be conducted and used to evaluate the consistency between lesson planning and implementation (Ropii & Fahrurrozi, 2017).

B. Reading Comprehension Learning Outcomes

This section presents the research findings concerning reading comprehension learning outcomes, examined through two main aspects: the distribution of questions based on Barrett's Taxonomy and the results of peer assessment of students' listening abilities.

Item Analysis

The analysis identified 330 questions distributed across the levels of Barrett's Taxonomy. Of these, 250 questions were categorized as literal comprehension, 52 questions as reorganization, and 28 questions as inferential comprehension. No questions were identified at the evaluative or appreciative levels. The dominance of literal comprehension indicates that the questions primarily measured students' ability to identify explicit information in texts. This ability remains important as a foundation before students progress toward more complex comprehension processes. Barrett's Taxonomy consists of five levels—literal comprehension, reorganization, inference, evaluation, and appreciation—which represent the development of comprehension demands from identifying information to evaluating reading materials (Himawan, 2023).

The presence of 52 reorganization questions and 28 inferential questions indicates an effort to direct students beyond simply identifying directly stated information. At the reorganization level, students are required to process and reorganize information contained in the text, whereas inference requires students to connect information in order to obtain

meanings that are not explicitly stated. The presence of these two levels provides variation in cognitive demands, although their numbers remain substantially lower than those of literal questions. Frans et al. (2023) found that literal comprehension and reorganization represent relatively lower levels of comprehension, whereas inference represents a higher level because it requires reasoning based on information contained in the reading text.

The absence of evaluative and appreciative questions is an important finding because students were not yet frequently given opportunities to assess the content of reading materials, consider the quality or accuracy of ideas, or provide responses based on their experiences and appreciation of texts. These levels are important for expanding reading abilities because students should not only understand the content of reading materials but also learn to provide judgments and responses to the information they read (Munaf, 2023).

The dominance of literal comprehension questions can be maintained to ensure that students master basic information contained in texts. However, questions involving reorganization, inference, evaluation, and appreciation should gradually be added so that students' reading abilities develop more comprehensively. This is important because reading instruction should not stop at the ability to identify written information but should also provide opportunities for students to connect information, draw conclusions, evaluate reading content, and respond to texts.

Analysis of Peer Assessment Results

Mutiara Shafa Azzahra achieved the highest score based on the average scores given by the assessment teams, receiving scores of 98 in the first assessment and 100 in the second and third assessments, resulting in an average of 99.77, which was rounded to 100. This score indicates that Mutiara's listening ability was in the very good category. Although three different texts and sets of questions were used—"Daya Tarik Pantai Teleng Ria Pacitan," "Karakteristik Pantai Tiga Warna," and another beach-related text—the differences among the scores were very small, indicating highly consistent listening ability. The findings demonstrate that Mutiara's ability to listen to LHO texts was assessed as very good by her peers, showing that peer assessment can provide an overview of students' abilities based on predetermined criteria while actively involving students in the assessment process. Arnawa (2021) explained that involving students as peer assessors can become part of the learning process because students not only receive assessments but also learn through evaluating other students' work. The high scores obtained across three assessments demonstrate consistency and may indicate that Mutiara's performance met the criteria established for peer assessment. Alifah et al. (2025) found that peer assessment can produce scores that have a strong relationship with teacher assessment when supported by clear criteria or rubrics. Overall, Mutiara's assessment results demonstrate that the implementation of peer assessment in LHO text learning provides students with opportunities to recognize the quality of learning outcomes based on established criteria, understand performance standards through comparing and evaluating their peers' work, and receive feedback that supports the learning process.

Maretni Putri Vihaningrum was assessed by three peers and obtained an intermediate score based on the average assessment. The texts used were "Pantai Gili Ketapang Probolinggo," "Pantai Srau sebagai Wisata Alam Pacitan," and "Karakteristik Pantai Goa Cina Malang." The three assessors gave scores of 90, 92, and 92, resulting in an average score of 92, placing her in the moderate or middle category. This result indicates adequate performance while still leaving room for improvement. The assessment results also demonstrate that student involvement as assessors provided additional information about Maretni's learning performance. An average score of 92 indicates that her work was good, although there was still room for further improvement to achieve a more optimal level of performance. In the context of peer assessment, the results do not merely function as scores but can also serve as a means for students to understand the criteria for successful task completion. Puspasary and Wicaksono (2025) explained that student involvement can support improvements in learning outcomes. Thus, Maretni's average score of 92 can be viewed as a good learning outcome while also indicating opportunities for further development. Teachers still need to provide guidance and ensure that students apply assessment criteria appropriately so that the scores are not based merely on personal impressions of their peers. The use of clear rubrics or criteria can improve the accuracy of peer assessment, as demonstrated by Alifah et al. (2025), who found that the use of rubrics can improve peer assessment accuracy while supporting improvements in student learning outcomes.

Naufal Nureizy Nafis was assessed by three peers and obtained the lowest score. The texts used were "Keunikan Pasir Putih Pantai Papuma Jember," "Pantai Sendiki dan Keasrian Alamnya," and "Fenomena Lautan Pasir Gunung Bromo." The scores recorded in the three assessments were 80, 88, and 90, resulting in an average score of 86, which placed the student in the lower-middle category. This result indicates that several aspects still need to be strengthened to improve listening comprehension. The scores of 80, 88, and 90 also indicate relatively consistent improvement across the assessment stages, suggesting that the student began to adapt to the assessment criteria and improve learning performance based on previous assessment experiences. Peer assessment does not merely function as a means of assigning scores but can also help students understand performance criteria and increase their involvement in the learning process. Alifah et al. (2025) explained that clear assessment criteria and procedures can improve the accuracy of peer assessment, while effective feedback can support improvements in students' learning processes. Therefore, an average score of 86 indicates that the student's learning outcome was reasonably good, although reinforcement is still required in aspects that have not yet been mastered optimally. Teachers can provide clearer guidance regarding assessment criteria and give students opportunities to improve their performance based on the feedback they receive.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that reading comprehension instruction using Barrett's Taxonomy in Grade IX at SMPN 1 Karanggeneng was conducted in stages and

dominated by literal comprehension and reorganization; meanwhile, evaluative and appreciative skills were not yet widely demonstrated, indicating a need to strengthen higher-order thinking skills. Furthermore, the implementation of peer assessment revealed that students could evaluate one another with reasonable objectivity, although the results still showed disparities in student achievement—signaling a need for guidance, clearer rubrics, and instructional development to foster more comprehensive reading comprehension skills..

REFERENCES

Adawiyah, S. R. (2023). Implementasi Peer-Assessment sebagai Salah Satu Teknik Penilaian Profil Pelajar Pancasila. Educatoria : Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan, 3(3), 191–201. https://doi.org/10.36312/educatoria.v3i3.194

Adetya, O. (2015). Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Teks Laporan Hasil Observasi Kelas VII SMP dan Kelas X SMA Kurikulum 2013 di Kabupaten Purworejo [Thesis (S1), Universitas Negri Yogyakarta]. https://eprints.uny.ac.id/18239/1/Okta%20Adetya%2010201241016.pdf

Adinoto, P. (2019). Pengaruh Kegiatan Awal Pembelajaran, Disiplin Belajar dan Motivasi Belajar Terhadap Prestasi Belajar. Jurnal Imiah Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 3(1), 53. https://doi.org/10.23887/jipp.v3i1.17110

Agustriani, D., & Nurjamin, A. (2026). Analisis Membaca Pemahaman Menggunakan Taksonomi Barret terhadap Siswa Kelas IVSDN 1 Sukamukti. Coretan Bahasa : Journal Indonesian Language and Literature, 1(1). https://coretanpena.org/jill/article/view/13/30

Ajijan, J., Aeni, E. S., & Lestari, R. D. (2018). Penerapam Model Discovery Learning Berbantuan Liveworksheet pada Pembelejaran Menulis Teks Laporan Hasil Observasi Siswa Kelas VII. PAROLE: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 1. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22460/parole.v6i3.20542

Alifah, N., Adinda Dwi Cahyani, Dea Kartika Utami, Ully Arta Silitonga, & Minarsi Minarsi. (2025). Teknik Skoring dan Penilaian dalam Evaluasi Pembelajaran di Abad 21, Serta Implikasinya dalam Bimbingan dan Konseling. GURUKU : Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sosial Humaniora, 3(4), 79–100. https://doi.org/10.59061/guruku.v3i4.1230

Anggreni, A. (2020). Experential Learning (Pembelajaran Berbasis Mengalami). At-Thullab : Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, 1(2), 186. https://doi.org/10.30736/atl.v1i2.86

Anwar, N., Romadhon, T. N., Sandro, A., & Khikmawanto, K. (2023). Peran Guru sebagai Fasilitator Pembelajaran dalam Mendorong Kreativitas Siswa. JURNAL SYNTAX IMPERATIF : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan, 4(3), 208–214. https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-imperatif.v4i3.240

Arnawa, N. (2021). Pengajaran Bahasa Berbasis Teks dan Penguatan Gerakan Literasi Sekolah. Seminar Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya (PEDALITRA I) Penguatan Literasi Melalui Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra.

Azani, A. (2024). Hakikat Belajar dan Pembelajaran. 1(5). https://malaqbipublisher.com/index.php/MAKSI/article/view/185/196

Cahyarani, M., & Priyatni, E. T. (2023). Proses Kognitif Bermuatan HOTS pada Pertanyaan, Tugas, dan Latihan dalam Buku Teks Siswa Bahasa Indonesia Kelas XI SMA Kemendikbud Edisi Revisi 2017. JoLLA: Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts, 3(3),

420–443. https://doi.org/10.17977/um064v3i32023p420-443

Deviana, T. (2018). Analisis Kebutuhan Pengembengan Model Pembelajaran Berbasis Kearifan Lokal Kabupaten Tulungagung untuk Kelas V SD Tema Bangga Sebagai Bangsa Indonesia. Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pengembangan Sekolah Dasar (JP2SD), 6(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.22219/jp2sd.v6i1.5902

Dewi, A. C., Fitri, S., Satriani, I., & Herdiani, R. (2025). Integrasi Konsep Deep Learning dalam Pengajaran Menulis: Upaya Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis dan Reflektif Siswa. INTELEKTUAL: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin Mahasiswa dan Akademisi, 1(5), 60–73.

Dolong, H. M. J. (2016). Sudut Pandang Perencanaan Dalam Pengembangan Pembelajaran. Volume V, Nomor 1. https://web.archive.org/web/20180428101327id_/http://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/Inspiratif-Pendidikan/article/viewFile/3213/3059

Fauzi, A., & Al-zainuri, A. (2024). Penerapan Assessment For Learning dalam Meningkatkan Keterampilan Reflektif Siswa. Pendiri: Jurnal Riset Pendidikan, 1(2), 42–49. https://doi.org/10.63866/pendiri.v1i2.59

Frans, S. A., Ani, Y., & Wijaya, Y. A. (2023). Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman Siswa Sekolah Dasar [Reading Comprehension Skills of Elementary School Students]. Diligentia: Journal of Theology and Christian Education, 5(1), 54. https://doi.org/10.19166/dil.v5i1.6567

Haholongan, R., Lukyana, S., Putri, M., Fajrina, F., Amalia, M., & Tarsono, O. (2024). Pemanfaatan Internet Sebagai Media Pembelajaran: Transisi Dari Sistem Konvensional Ke Sistem Digital Dalam Kegiatan Belajar Pada Siswa Smp Pembangunan Jakarta Timur. Jurnal Pengbadian Masyarakat Ilmu Terapan (JPMIT), 6(1), 7–12. https://doi.org/10.33772/jpmit.v6i1.2

Himawan, R. (2023). Analisis Lever Kritis Taksonomi Barret pada Soal Pemantapan Asesmen Daerah Literasi Membaca Siswa Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. Prodi Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia, Pascasarjana Universitas, 3(1). https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.37905/rjppbi.v3i1.1962

Kemendikdasmen. (2025). Kurikulum Merdeka [Pendidikan]. https://ditsd.kemendikdasmen.go.id/hal/kurikulum-merdeka

Kholiq, A., & Luthfiyati, D. (2020). Tingkat Membaca Pemahaman Siwa SMA Kabupaten Lamongan. KREDO : Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra, 4(1), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.24176/kredo.v4i1.3535

Muhadi, M., Jarir, J., Khairina, K., Rajuna, R., & Prasetyo, E. (2025). Evaluasi Perencanaan Desain Pembelajaran, Pelaksanaan Proses Kegiatan Pembelajaran, dan Evaluasi Instrumen Hasil Pembelajaran. EDU SOCIETY: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat, 5(2), 156–165. https://doi.org/10.56832/edu.v5i2.1084

Munaf, G. (2023). Analisis Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman Berdasarkan pada Taksonomi Barret Menggunakan Model Pembelajaran Small Group Discussion pada Siswa Kelas VI SD Plus Hang Tuah 4 Jakarta.

Nurhidayati, N. (2013). Pembelajaran Menyimak Apresiatif Cerita Pendek Dengan Strategi Belajar Kooperatif. LITERA, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v10i1.1175

Pratiwi, N. M. W., Suarmayanti, K. I., I Wayan Widyastama, Ni Putu Sepnita Lestari Yanti, & Ida Bagus Putrayasa. (2025). Keterampilan Menyimak sebagai Kunci Efektivitas Komunikasi dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Sekolah Dasar. JPG: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru, 6(3), 459–464. https://doi.org/10.32832/jpg.v6i3.20831

Puspasary, A. Q., & Wicaksono, A. (2025). Implementasi Model Sefl Directed Learning dalam

Pembelajaran Menulis Laporan Hasil ObservasiI.

Rahma, F. F. (2020). Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman Berdasarkan Taksonomi Barret Pada Siswa Kelas VI MI Nurul Hikmah Kabupaten Probolinggo [Skripsi, Universitas Islam Negeri Maualana Malik Ibramhim]. http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/24312/1/16140127.pdf

Rahman, S. (2021). Pentingnya Motivasi Belajar dalam Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar. PROSIDING SEMINAR NASIONAL PENDIDIKAN DASAR: Merdeka Belajar dalam Menyambut Era Masyarakat 5.0. https://ejurnal.pps.ung.ac.id/index.php/PSNPD/article/view/1076

Ropii, M., & Fahrurrozi, Muh. (2017). Evaluasi Hasil Belajar (Pertama). Universitas Hamzandi Press. https://eprints.hamzanwadi.ac.id/4178/1/1%20EVALUASI%20HASIL%20BELAJAR.pdf

Rosida, M., & Intiana, S. (2023). Analisis Keterampilan Siswa Kelas VIII C SMPN 3 Lingsar dalam Mengonstruksi Teks Laporan Hasil Observasi. https://eprints.unram.ac.id/48520/2/JURNAL_ROSIDA_E1C020167.pdf

Sarifah, N., & Hanif, M. (2025). Efektivitas pembelajaran kolaboratif dalam meningkatkan interaksi sosial di kelas: Pembelajaran kolaboratif. Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.36636/jipsos.v3i1.5988

Seliro Wangi, N. B., Machsunah, Y. C., & Hasbullah, M. A. (2022). Model Pembelajaran. Academia Publication. https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=LbVmEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=info:8Gqp1xD0FZEJ:scholar.google.com&ots=jHQjVkiTte&sig=XBGQE_b-ubRA-w_mEuaNzHvKYJ8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Shulhan. (2026). PEMBELAJARAN AKTIF DAN KOLABORATIF: Strategi Efektif Meingkatkan Hasil Belajar dan Pembentukkan Karakter Melalui Group Invertigation (Pertama). PUSTAKA AKSARA. https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=vrHaEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Rangkaian+aktivitas+tersebut+menunjukkan+bahwa+pembelajaran+dirancang+untuk+memberikan+pengalaman+belajar+yang+aktif,+kolaboratif,+sekaligus+melatih+tanggung+jawab+siswa+dalam+menilai+hasil+kerja+teman+secara+objektif.&ots=R24SFCiFlF&sig=3NLCOmvVQ9KlwmT0aacmx1mLmK8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Suttrisno, S., Yulia, N. M., & Fithriyah, D. N. (2022). Mengembangkan Kompetensi Guru Dalam Melaksanakan Evaluasi Pembelajaran Di Era Merdeka Belajar. ZAHRA: Research and Tought Elementary School of Islam Journal, 3(1), 52–60. https://doi.org/10.37812/zahra.v3i1.409

Tarigan, H. G. (2015). Membaca Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa (Revisi). Penerbit Angkasa.

Tillah, M. (2020). Kemampuan Menganalisis Teks Laporan Hasil Observasi Siswa Kelas X IPS1 SAM Negeri 2 Kelayang Kabupaten Indragiri Hulu Tahun Ajaran 2019/2020. Repository.uir. https://repository.uir.ac.id/7625/1/156210741.pdf

Ulfah, A., Zumaisaroh, N., Fitriyah, L., & Jesica, E. (2022). Model Pembelajaran Literacy Circle sebagai Inovasi Pembelajaran Menulis Puisi di Era Merdeka Belajar. GHANCARAN: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 216–229. https://doi.org/10.19105/ghancaran.vi.7588