



Vol. 4, No. 3, September 2026, pp. 2279-2291

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF

POST AXIAL

FUTURISTIC TEACHING AND LEARNING

<https://journal.amorfati.id/index.php/postaxial> | ISSN 3025-7549



Analysis of the Cognitive Level of Reading and Writing Tasks in the Netzwerk Neu A1 Testheft

Adi Purnama^{1a}, Mohamad Nur Fauzi^{2b}

¹²Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

^aadipurnamadeutsch@gmail.com, ^bmohamadnurfuzi@upi.edu

Article History:

Received:

20-07-2026

Revised:

22-08-2026

Accepted:

28-09-2026

Keywords:

Cognitive Level, Reading,
Writing, Netzwerk Neu A1

*Correspondence Address:

adipurnamadeutsch@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study aims to analyze the distribution of lower-order thinking skills (LOTS) and higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) in the reading and writing tasks in the Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1, based on Bloom's Revised Taxonomy. The study employed a qualitative approach using content analysis. The data source consisted of all reading and writing tasks in the Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1, covering Chapters 1 through 12. Data were collected through the identification, classification, and analysis of the cognitive level of each task based on categories C1-C6. Data analysis was conducted through data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions. The results indicate that reading skills are dominated by Level C2 (understanding), while writing skills are dominated by Level C3 (applying). HOTS were found in both skills but in different proportions. In reading skills, HOTS appeared only at Level C4 (analyzing), whereas in writing skills, HOTS appeared at Level C6 (creating). These findings indicate that the Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1 remains more oriented toward developing students' ability to understand and apply the language than toward higher-order thinking skills. Nevertheless, the presence of tasks at levels C4 and C6 demonstrates that HOTS can be integrated into A1-level German language learning through task designs that are appropriate for students' linguistic abilities.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Introduction (مقدمة)

Education in the 21st century is not limited to the ability to understand lesson content. Nowadays, learning places a stronger emphasis on critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication. These four competencies are known as the 4C skills (Thornhill-Miller et al., 2023). In Indonesia, these competencies have been implemented through the *Kurikulum Merdeka*.

The curriculum establishes Higher-Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) as a foundation for success in interdisciplinary learning, including foreign languages (Susanti et al., 2020).

This policy has implications for the current educational process. Existing learning tools and assessment instruments must also encourage students to analyze, evaluate, and create. These three cognitive levels align with the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002). It should be emphasized that the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy features intersecting dimensions. Specifically, these two interrelated aspects are cognitive processes (C1–C6) and the knowledge dimension, which comprises factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive knowledge (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In this context, a comprehensive analysis of assessment instruments should ideally consider both dimensions. The quality of an assignment can be evaluated based on cognitive levels and types of knowledge. In language learning, this is directly relevant to developing German language proficiency, which generally comprises four core skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) (Fitriani et al., 2025).

This aligns with the principles of Bloom's Taxonomy, which are expected to be reflected in A2-level German language skills (*Gemeinsamer Europäischer Referenzrahmen für Sprachen/GER*) (Elfiana, 2014). Therefore, this study analyzes the test items in *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* against the Phase F Learning Outcomes (*Capaian Pembelajaran/CP*). The alignment between these two elements can strengthen the relevance of the findings to the national curriculum. Kudriyah (2021) highlights the importance of developing HOTS-based reading tests at the GER A1 level. HOTS-based learning evaluation in the context of A1 German in Indonesia is not merely a normative requirement, but the integration of HOTS into German language instruction has already underway.

Practical realities fail to reflect this necessity. In general, German language learning in Indonesian senior high schools generally remains limited to vocabulary memorization and monotonous grammar drills (Malik et al., 2020). This approach cannot be entirely faulted. A1-level learning within the “Common European Framework of Reference for Languages” (CEFR) focuses on mastering everyday expressions and simple sentences (Prajapati, 2022). However, the problem lies in the prevailing assumption that beginner-level learning does not need to be accompanied by higher-order thinking practice. This is precisely what needs to be reconsidered.

At this point, it is important to recognize a contradiction in the study of second- or third-language learning. Limited cognitive capacity at the A1 level can create obstacles in the learning process. Learners' limited thinking abilities are constrained by their use of the target language, leaving little room for higher-order thinking tasks (Botezatu et al., 2022). However, this does not mean that HOTS should be overlooked. Rather, it further emphasizes the importance of carefully designing tasks. HOTS is not synonymous with complex language. Higher-order thinking can be developed through tasks that require cognitive engagement while remaining linguistically accessible to learners (Irnansyah, et al., 2022).

In reading skills, HOTS can be applied through tasks that encourage learners to draw conclusions from simple texts. In writing skills, meanwhile, HOTS can be implemented through the production of short, meaningful texts appropriate to specific communicative situations. Research (Kudriyah, 2021) emphasizes the importance of applying the HOTS concept with a focus on critical thinking skills. Therefore, language limitations at the A1 level should not be regarded as a barrier to HOTS but rather as an aspect that needs to be appropriately considered. A study by Mahdiah (2019) found a dominance of LOTS in foreign language assessment instruments in Indonesia. This phenomenon has also been observed across various languages, indicating a systemic issue.

Based on the discussion above, several research gaps can be identified. First, studies that specifically analyze the *Testheft* component of the German-language teaching material

Netzwerk Neu A1 as an assessment instrument remain very limited. Second, most previous studies have examined samples restricted to a single chapter or topic, making it difficult to generalize their findings. Addressing these gaps, this study analyzes all Chapters 1–12 of *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1*, focusing on reading and writing skills. These skills were selected based on several practical considerations. In the *Kurikulum Merdeka* (Independent Curriculum), implicit interpretation is defined as an indicator of core reading competence (Sayuti & Nurbaya, 2026), while creative text production serves as an indicator of writing competence (Ismayani, 2017). These competencies correspond to C2 (Understanding) and C4 (Analyzing) (Himawan & Suyata, 2023), while creative text production corresponds to C6 (Creating) in the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy (Listiani & Rachmawati, 2022). Both skills therefore provide a relevant basis for examining HOTS in foreign-language assessment instruments at the A1 level and can also be linked to the skills specified in the curriculum for Phase F.

Theoretically, this study's analysis is based on the cognitive dimensions of the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy. This framework is influential in the design of competency-based learning and assessment (Airasian & Miranda, 2002). It divides cognitive processes into six levels: Remembering (C1), Understanding (C2), Applying (C3), Analyzing (C4), Evaluating (C5), and Creating (C6), with the first three classified as LOTS and the latter three as HOTS (Meriza et al., 2022). Brookhart (2010) states that the core of HOTS lies in the quality of the thinking processes required. In this context, an assessment instrument such as *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* ideally should not only measure factual knowledge but also assess learners' ability to apply knowledge in new situations. This is in line with the principle of deep learning emphasized in the curriculum, namely learning that is conscious, meaningful, and enjoyable (Kemendikdasmen, 2025).

In foreign language learning, reading and writing are two competencies with distinct cognitive characteristics. Reading is a receptive skill that focuses on the processes of understanding, interpreting, and constructing meaning from written texts, whereas writing is a productive skill that requires learners to produce texts for specific communicative purposes. In the context of German as a foreign language, both skills serve as important indicators for measuring the development of learners' communicative competence.

At this level, reading ability is still primarily oriented toward literal comprehension and the identification of information that is directly available in the text. Nevertheless, reading ability is not limited to the process of locating information but also involves cognitive activities such as connecting information, comparing the content of several texts, and drawing simple conclusions based on the available context. Therefore, reading skills have the potential to develop higher-order thinking skills even when learners' language proficiency remains limited.

Meanwhile, writing skills at the A1 level, according to the Council of Europe (2020), include the ability to complete forms, write short messages, make simple notes, and write emails or short texts related to everyday experiences and needs. Writing activities require learners to select relevant information, organize ideas logically, and use linguistic elements appropriate to the communicative purpose. Hyland (2019) explains that writing is a process of meaning construction involving the planning, organization, and communication of messages to readers. Thus, writing skills have greater potential to elicit higher-order cognitive processes because learners are required to produce original language products based on the linguistic resources available to them.

The differences in the characteristics of reading and writing indicate that the distribution of cognitive levels across the two skills is not necessarily the same. Reading skills tend to involve processes of understanding and analyzing available information, whereas writing skills allow for the emergence of the creating process because learners produce new texts to fulfill

specific communicative purposes. Therefore, the analysis of HOTS in *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* needs to be conducted separately for each skill so that the cognitive characteristics of each can be mapped more accurately.



Method (منهج)

This study employs a qualitative approach using content analysis as the primary analytical technique. This design was selected because the data under investigation consist of written texts, and the study aims to analyze and describe the cognitive levels of tasks based on the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy through an interpretative approach. Krippendorff (2019) defines content analysis as a research technique used to draw replicable and valid inferences from texts in relation to the contexts of their use. Similarly, Creswell and Poth (2018) emphasize that qualitative content analysis does not merely involve counting the occurrence of categories but also interpreting the meanings underlying the texts within a broader context. The focus of the study is the document as the source of data, specifically the assessment instrument examined in terms of its cognitive characteristics.

The primary data source is the textbook *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* by Karin Ransberger, Margret Rodi, and Kirsten Althaus, published by Ernst Klett Sprachen in 2019. The textbook was selected based on three considerations: (a) the *Netzwerk Neu* series is one of the most popular and widely used German-language teaching materials among course institutions and senior high schools in Indonesia (Khairynanto, 2020); (b) *Testheft* serves as a summative assessment instrument that measures learning achievement after learners complete each chapter; and (c) there is still limited research examining the cognitive levels of tasks in this textbook. The data source was selected through purposive sampling based on the criteria of relevance, popularity of use, and accessibility as an object of investigation within the academic literature.

The unit of analysis in this study comprises all reading and writing tasks in *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* from Chapters 1 to 12. Reading tasks were identified as tasks that include short texts, such as dialogues, announcements, letters, or brief descriptions, followed by multiple-choice, true/false, or short-answer questions. Writing tasks were identified as tasks that explicitly require learners to produce written texts, such as completing forms, writing emails, short letters, or descriptive paragraphs. Based on these criteria, a total of 14 reading tasks and 19 writing tasks were identified as the units of analysis.

To ensure the objectivity and consistency of the classification, the researcher developed a cognitive-level classification framework adapted from the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). The framework includes operational verbs for each level from C1 to C6, which were adjusted to the characteristics of German-language tasks at the A1 level. Data collection was conducted through the following procedures: (1) reading the *entire Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* from Chapters 1 to 12; (2) identifying and marking each task classified as a reading or writing task based on the established criteria; (3) transcribing each identified task into an analysis worksheet; (4) freely translating each task into Indonesian to facilitate the classification process; and (5) for reading tasks containing texts, transcribing the stimulus texts in their entirety to ensure that the overall context was taken into consideration during the analysis. All data collection was conducted using Microsoft Excel.

Data analysis was adapted from the analytical model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), which consists of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. To ensure data validity, two techniques were employed: internal rechecking and theoretical triangulation. The classification results were compared with several

sources of literature on the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy and HOTS, as well as with examples of classifications published in indexed academic journals.



Result (نتائج) and Discussion



Results of Reading Skills

Based on the findings from 14 reading tasks, the cognitive-level classification of each task is presented as follows.

Bab	Aufgabe (task)	Task Instructions	Task Description	Cognitive Level	Category
1	7	<i>Lesen Sie und notieren Sie die Informationen</i>	Reading and noting information from the text.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
3	3	<i>Lesen Sie den Text. Ergänzen Sie die Wörter</i>	Reading a text and completing the blanks with the provided answer choices.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
4	4	<i>Lesen Sie die Einladung und die Aufgaben. Sind die Sätze richtig oder falsch? Kreuzen Sie an</i>	Reading an invitation and determining whether the statements are true or false based on the text.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
4	5	<i>Lesen Sie den Text und beantworten Sie die Fragen mit ganzen Sätzen.</i>	Reading a text and answering the questions using complete sentences.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
5	6	<i>Lesen Sie die beiden Texte und die Aufgaben 1 bis 5. Kreuzen Sie an: richtig oder falsch.</i>	Determining whether the answers are correct or incorrect based on the text.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
5	7	<i>Eine E-Mail schreiben. Ergänzen Sie</i>	Completing the gaps in the sentences using the provided answer choices.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
6	6	<i>Lesen Sie die Texte und die Aufgabe 1 bis 5. Kreuzen Sie an richtig oder falsch.</i>	Determining whether the information is correct or incorrect based on the statements.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
7	5	<i>Sie lesen drei Anzeigen. Dazu gibt</i>	Reading advertisements	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS

		<i>es zwei fragen. Antworten Sie mit Ja oder Nein.</i>	and matching the situations with the appropriate advertisements.		
8	6	<i>Sie lesen fünf kurze Texte (Text A-E). Zu jedem Text gibt es je ein Bild (Bild 1-6). Welches Bild passt zum Text? Achtung: Ein Bild ist zu viel</i>	Reading short texts and matching the pictures with the situations described in the texts.	C4 (Analyzing)	HOTS
9	5	<i>Lesen Sie die Email und die Aufgaben. Sind die Sätze richtig oder falsch? Kreuzen Sie an.</i>	Determining whether the information is correct or incorrect based on the text.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
10	7	<i>Sie suchen verschiedenen Dinge in der Zeitung. Finden Sie zu jeder Situatuonen (A-E) dipassende Anzeige (1-6). Achtung: Eine Anzeige ist zu viel.</i>	Matching the situations with the appropriate advertisements.	C4 (Analyzing)	HOTS
11	5	<i>Im Kaufhaus. Wo finden Sie das? Lesen Sie die Tafel und notieren Sie.</i>	Identifying the information that corresponds to the text.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
11	6	<i>Lesen Sie die Texte. Welche Ueberschrift pass/ Ordnen Sie zu.</i>	Matching the texts with the appropriate titles or topics.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
12	5	<i>Lesen Sie die Texte und die Aufgaben 1- 5. Auf welcher Webseite finden Sie die Informationen Kreuzen Sie an: a oder b?</i>	Determining information based on the advertisements and statements.	C4 (Analyzing)	HOTS

Table 1. Cognitive Levels of Reading Tasks

Table 1 shows that the majority of reading tasks in *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* are classified at the C2 (Understanding) level, while only a small proportion reach the C4 (Analyzing) level. This finding indicates that reading assessment in the textbook remains oriented toward understanding explicit information available in the text. Most tasks require learners to identify information, determine whether statements are correct or incorrect, match information with the text, and complete parts of the text based on the available context.

The dominance of the C2 level can be attributed to the characteristics of reading competence at the A1 level of the CEFR. At this level, learners are still developing basic vocabulary and understanding simple information related to everyday needs. Therefore, tasks that require literal comprehension are important as a foundation before learners are able to engage in more complex interpretation. In other words, the dominance of C2 in *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* does not necessarily indicate a weakness in the assessment design but also

reflects the competency demands established for beginner-level learners.

However, these findings also indicate that reading assessment in *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* still tends to view reading as an activity of information retrieval. Modern literacy perspectives regard reading not only as the ability to locate information but also as the ability to interpret, compare, evaluate, and use information to construct new understanding. In this context, the limited number of C4-level tasks indicates that learners have relatively limited opportunities to develop analytical thinking skills through reading activities.

The presence of several C4-level tasks is an important finding because it demonstrates that HOTS can still be integrated into A1-level German language learning. These tasks require learners to compare multiple pieces of information, determine relationships between the situations and the available texts, or select the most appropriate information from several alternatives. Such activities no longer require only literal comprehension but also the ability to connect various pieces of information before making a decision. This finding supports Brookhart's (2010) view that HOTS is not determined by the level of language difficulty but rather by the thinking processes required to complete a task.

Theoretically, the findings of this study contribute to the discussion of the relationship between linguistic and cognitive abilities in foreign language learning. There has been an assumption that beginner-level learners cannot yet develop HOTS due to their limited language proficiency. However, the findings demonstrate that higher-order thinking demands can still be elicited through the use of simple language when task design focuses on analytical activities and decision-making.

From a practical perspective, these findings indicate the need to enrich reading tasks by placing greater emphasis on drawing conclusions, interpretation, and the comparison of information. Teachers can modify existing tasks by adding open-ended questions, asking learners to explain the reasons for their answers, or having them compare several simple texts with similar themes. In this way, higher-order thinking skills can be developed without increasing the linguistic complexity beyond the capabilities of A1-level learners.

Writing Skills

Based on the analysis of *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1*, 19 writing tasks with varying cognitive levels were identified. The range of cognitive levels spans from C1 to C6. Table 2 presents the cognitive-level classification of each writing task.

Chapter	Aufgabe (Task)	Task Instructions	Task Description	Cognitive Level	Category
1	4	<i>Schreiben Sie W-Fragen und Aussagesätze</i>	Constructing sentences using the provided vocabulary.	C3(Applying)	LOTS
1	8	<i>Ergänzen Sie das Formular. Fiktive Antworten sind auch gut</i>	Completing a form according to the requested information.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
2	4	<i>Schreiben Sie Ja-/Nein-Fragen</i>	Constructing sentences using the provided vocabulary.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
2	7	<i>Sie möchten einen Yogakurs besuchen.</i>	Completing a form according to the	C3 (Applying)	LOTS

		<i>Bitte füllen Sie das Formular aus. Sie können die Antworten auch erfinden</i>	requested information.		
3	6	<i>Wo ist...? Schreiben Sie die Sätze im Imperativ</i>	Writing sentences using the given instructions.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
4	7	<i>Und Sie? Schreiben Sie zu jeder Frage ein bis zwei Sätze</i>	Writing sentences according to the questions.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
5	5	<i>Und Sie? Schreiben Sie die Sätze mit Modalverb. Beginnen Sie mit dem markiertem Wort.</i>	Constructing sentences based on the vocabulary provided.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
6	7	<i>Schreiben Sie eine Einladung</i>	Writing an invitation.	C6 (Creating)	HOTS
7	6	<i>Lesen Sie die Email und antworten Sie.</i>	Writing an email response.	C6 (Creating)	HOTS
7	7	<i>Ergänzen Sie die fuerf Informationen aus dem Text im Formluar.</i>	Completing a form.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
8	5	<i>Schreiben Sie Sätze im Imperativ. Beginnen Sie mit du, ihr oder Sie</i>	Writing sentences based on the expressions provided.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
8	7	<i>Schreiben Sie eine Entschuldigung</i>	Writing an email requesting an apology.	C6 (Creating)	HOTS
9	6	<i>Und Sie? Schreiben Sie über Ihre Wohnung. Schreiben Sie zu jedem Punkt einen Satz</i>	Writing short descriptions of one's own apartment.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
9	7	<i>Lesen Sie die E-Mail und antworten Sie. ... Antworten Sie Emil. Schreiben Sie circa 30 Wörter. Beantworten Sie alle Fragen. Schreiben Sie am Ende einen Gruß</i>	Writing an email response.	C6 (Creating)	HOTS
10	4	<i>Schreiben Sie Sätze im Perfekt. Beginnen Sie mit dem markiertem Wort</i>	Writing sentences in the blanks using the vocabulary provided.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
10	6	<i>Eine Anmeldung bei der Jobbörse. Ergänzen Sie Sie</i>	Completing a form.	C2 (Understanding)	LOTS
11	7	<i>Schreiben Sie eine Antwort.</i>	Writing an email response.	C6 (Creating)	HOTS

12	4	<i>Schreiben Sie die Fragen zu den Sätzen 1-5 wie im Beispiel.</i>	Writing questions based on the information in the sentences.	C3 (Applying)	LOTS
12	6	<i>Sie waren im Urlaub. Schreiben Sie eine E-Mail</i>	Writing an email.	C6 (Creating)	HOTS

Table 2. Distribution of Cognitive Levels of Writing Tasks

The analysis results presented in Table 2 show that the distribution of cognitive levels in writing skills is more diverse than that in reading skills. Writing tasks were found at the C2, C3, and C6 levels, with a predominance of C3 (Applying) and the relatively consistent occurrence of C6 (Creating) across several chapters. These findings indicate that the assessment of writing skills in *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* is not solely oriented toward mastery of language forms but also toward the ability to use language to produce communicative products.

Most writing tasks require learners to apply previously learned grammatical patterns, vocabulary, and expressions in new contexts. Activities such as completing forms, constructing sentences, transforming sentence forms, and writing personal information demonstrate that learners do not merely recall linguistic rules but also use them functionally. Thus, writing tasks in the *Testheft* have moved beyond the reproduction of knowledge and begun to promote communicative language use.

More notably, several tasks were classified at the C6 (Creating) level. These tasks involve writing emails, invitations, personal messages, and responses to specific situations. In completing these tasks, learners must determine relevant information, organize ideas, and produce texts appropriate to specific communicative purposes. These activities demonstrate that learners do not simply reproduce previously learned language forms but combine various linguistic elements to produce new products. Therefore, these tasks meet the characteristics of the creating level in the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.

This finding is significant because it demonstrates that the ability to create does not necessarily require learners to reach a high level of language proficiency. Creating has often been associated with intermediate or advanced learners because it is considered to require complex language skills. However, the findings of this study demonstrate that creating activities can emerge even at the A1 level, as long as the scope of the tasks is adapted to learners' linguistic abilities. Thus, cognitive complexity and linguistic complexity are two distinct aspects and do not necessarily develop simultaneously.

Theoretically, these findings support the view that productive skills have greater potential for developing HOTS than receptive skills. Writing requires learners to simultaneously engage in planning, information selection, idea organization, and language production. Therefore, writing activities naturally provide greater opportunities for higher-order thinking processes than reading activities, which primarily focus on understanding information that is already available.

Based on these findings, German language teachers do not need to wait until learners reach the A2 or B1 level to begin developing HOTS. Simple activities such as writing emails, creating invitations, composing messages, or responding to everyday situations can already be used as a means of developing higher-order thinking skills. In other words, HOTS can be developed gradually from the A1 level through authentic and meaningful productive tasks.

To provide a more comprehensive overview of the cognitive distribution across both reading and writing skills, Table 3 presents the results.

Cognitive Level	Reading		Writing		Category
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
C1 (Remembering)	0	0%	0	0%	LOTS
C2 (Understanding)	11	78,57%	1	5,26%	LOTS
C3 (Applying)	0	0%	13	68.42%	LOTS
C4 (Analyzing)	3	21.43 %	0	0%	HOTS
C5 (Evaluating)	0	0%	0	0%	HOTS
C6 (Creating)	0	0%	5	26.32%	HOTS
LOTS	11	78.57%	14	73.68%	
HOTS	3	21.43%	5	26.32%	
Total	14	100%	19	100%	

Table 3. Distribution of LOTS and HOTS Tasks in Reading and Writing Skills*

Table 3 shows differences in the distribution of cognitive levels between reading and writing skills. In reading skills, the majority of tasks fall into the LOTS category (78.57%), while HOTS accounts for only 21.43%. In writing skills, a higher proportion of HOTS is observed, accounting for 26.32%, although the LOTS category still predominates at 73.68%.

This difference indicates that the assessment orientation in Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1 is not yet balanced across language skills. In reading skills, tasks are primarily directed toward identifying explicit information, understanding the content of texts, and matching the information provided. Such activities are indeed appropriate for the characteristics of A1-level learners, who are still at the stage of vocabulary acquisition and literal meaning comprehension. However, the dominance of tasks at the understanding level indicates that reading assessment remains oriented toward the reproduction of information.

The limited occurrence of C4-level tasks indicates that learners are rarely given opportunities to compare different sources of information, identify relationships between ideas, or draw inferences based on texts. However, these abilities constitute an important foundation for the development of critical literacy, which is one of the directions of strengthening within the *Kurikulum Merdeka*. In other words, although the characteristics of A1-level learners require the use of simple language, the complexity of thinking can still be increased through task designs that require reasoning.

Writing skills demonstrate a more progressive tendency. The occurrence of C6-level tasks in five items indicates that the developers of *Testheft* have provided learners with opportunities to independently produce language-based products. Activities such as writing invitations, emails, and personal messages require learners to select information, organize ideas, and construct texts according to specific communicative purposes. This process is consistent with the characteristics of the creating level in the Revised Bloom's Taxonomy, as learners do not merely reproduce language forms but also produce new texts based on the linguistic resources at their disposal.

These findings also demonstrate that limitations in language proficiency at the A1 level do not automatically constrain the emergence of HOTS. Cognitive complexity is not determined by the level of linguistic difficulty but rather by the thinking demands that learners must engage in when completing a task. Therefore, the findings of this study support the view that HOTS can be integrated from the early stages of foreign language learning through appropriately designed tasks.

The relatively low proportion of HOTS indicates that *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* has incorporated elements of higher-order thinking skills, but has not yet made them a primary orientation of the assessment. This condition highlights the need for task enrichment, particularly in reading skills, so that assessment not only measures learners' ability to comprehend information but also encourages them to interpret, analyze, and make decisions based on the information available.



Conclusion (خاتمة)

This study demonstrates that *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* is an instrument that is not limited to the LOTS category, although it has not yet achieved the ideal distribution of HOTS as mandated by the Kurikulum Merdeka (Independent Curriculum). The analysis of 14 reading tasks and 19 writing tasks reveals mutually reinforcing findings. Reading skills are predominantly categorized at the LOTS level under C2 (78,57%), with a HOTS contribution of 21.43% that appears exclusively at the C4 level. On the other hand, writing skills display a more diverse cognitive profile, dominated by LOTS with a distribution at 73.68% (comprising C2 and C3) and a HOTS proportion of 26.32% which is entirely concentrated at the C6 level. The inclusion of 5 tasks at the C6 level (26.32%) provides empirical evidence that creation at the A1 proficiency level is feasible and can be implemented.

With a HOTS proportion of 21.43% in reading skills and 26.32% in writing skills, *Testheft Netzwerk Neu A1* demonstrates an effort to integrate higher-order thinking skills, although its distribution remains predominantly concentrated in the LOTS category. These findings indicate that the development of HOTS at the A1 level has already begun to be accommodated, particularly through writing tasks that require learners to independently produce language-based output. However, the absence of higher level HOTS tasks (C5 and C6) in reading skills represents a gap that requires attention. German language teachers in Indonesia have a role to play in modifying existing tasks by incorporating evaluative and creative elements, or in designing HOTS-based enrichment tasks that can be integrated into formative assessment in the classroom.

Acknowledgment (شكر وتقدير)

Acknowledgment is addressed to a person and/or groups and also the institution that helps research both in a direct and indirect way.



Bibliography (مراجع)

- Airasian, P. W., & Miranda, H. (2002). The role of assessment in the revised taxonomy. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(4), 249–254. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_8
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing; A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.
- Botezatu, M. R., Weissheimer, J., Ribeiro, M., Guo, T., Finger, I., & Mota, N. B. (2022). Graph structure analysis of speech production among second language learners of Spanish and Chinese. *Frontiers in*

- Psychology, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.940269>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2010). *How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom*. ASCD
- Council of Europe (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages : learning, teaching, assessment : companion volume*.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Efiana, A. (2014). DIE BEWERTUNG DER SPRECHFERTIGKEIT AN DER SMA. *LATERNE*, 3(3), 249-511. <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/laterne/article/view/9659>
- Fitriani, D. R., Silitonga, I. A., Utari, P., Pulungan, U. A., & Surbakti, Y. S. (2025). Analisis Kesesuaian Tujuan Pembelajaran Modul “Deutsch für Klasse XI” dengan Permendikbud. *MUDABBIR Journal Reserch and Education Studies*, 5(1), 540–548. <https://doi.org/10.56832/mudabbir.v5i1.829>
- Himawan, R., & Suyata, P. (2023). Analisis Sebaran Level Kognitif HOTS Berdasarkan Taksonomi Bloom pada Soal Penilaian Harian Materi Teks Pidato Persuasif di SMPN 1 Bambanglipuro Bantul. *Stilistika Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 16(1), 89–89. <https://doi.org/10.30651/st.v16i1.14208>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Irnansyah, I., Mirizon, S., & Petrus, I. (2022). Developing HOTS-based descriptive reading materials in Indonesian context for tenth graders. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10(2), 645–654. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i2.6301>
- Ismayani, R. M. (2017). KREATIVITAS DALAM PEMBELAJARAN LITERASI TEKS SASTRA. *Semantik*, 2(2), 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.22460/semantik.v2i2.p67-86>
- Kementerian Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2025. Panduan Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Jerman Fase F. Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan.
- Khairynanto, A. L. (2020). *Analyse der Schreibaufgaben im Lehrwerk Netzwerk A1*. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Kudriyah, S. (2021). Penyusunan Tes Membaca (Detailliertes Lesen) Tingkat A1 GER Berbasis HOTS. *BAHAS*, 32(1), 10–10. <https://doi.org/10.24114/bhs.v32i1.25440>
- Listiani, W., & Rachmawati, R. (2022). Transformasi Taksonomi Bloom dalam Evaluasi Pembelajaran Berbasis HOTS. *JURNAL JENDELA PENDIDIKAN*, 2(3), 397–402. <https://doi.org/10.57008/jjp.v2i03.266>
- Mahdiah, M. (2019). The Analysis of The Dimension Of Thinking Process (LOTS, MOTS, HOTS) On Objective Test Of English Evaluation Instrument. <https://idr.uin-antasari.ac.id/12995/>
- Malik, A. R., Emzir, & Sumarni, S. (2020). PENGARUH STRATEGI PEMBELAJARAN MOBILE LEARNING DAN GAYA BELAJAR VISUAL TERHADAP PENGUASAAN KOSAKATABAHASA JERMAN PESERTA DIDIK SMA NEGERI 1 MAROS. *Visipena Journal*, 11(1), 194–207. <https://doi.org/10.46244/visipena.v11i1.1090>
- Meriza, N., Pramudiyanti, P., Maulina, D., & Marpaung, R. R. T. (2022). DESKRIPSI PEMAHAMAN GURU MGMP LAMPUNG TIMUR TERHADAP PERTANYAAN LOTS DAN HOTS SEBAGAI HASIL PELATIHAN MENDESAIN PERTANYAAN. *Ruang Pengabdian Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 2(1), 94–102. <https://doi.org/10.23960/rp/v2i1.hal.94-102>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Prajapati, M. (2022). Introductory Guide to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for English Language Teachers. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities*, 2(6), 291–296. <https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.2.6.40>
- Sayuti, F. M., & Nurbaya, St. (2026). Analisis Kritis Capaian Pembelajaran Kompetensi Literasi Membaca Teks Non-Sastra dalam Buku Bahasa Indonesia Kelas VII Berdasarkan Kurikulum Merdeka. *JURNAL MANAJEMEN PENDIDIKAN DAN ILMU SOSIAL*, 7(1), 772–785. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jmpis.v7i1.6802>

- Susanti, A., Retnaningdyah, P., Ayu, A. N. P., & Trisusana, A. (2020). Improving EFL Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills Through Collaborative Strategic Reading in Indonesia. *International Journal of Asian Education*, 1(2), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.46966/ijä.v1i2.37>
- Thornhill-Miller, B., Camarda, A., Mercier, M., Burkhardt, J., Morisseau, T., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., Vinchon, F., Hayek, S. E., Augereau-Landais, M., Mourey, F., Feybesse, C., Sundquist, D., & Lubart, T. (2023). Creativity, Critical Thinking, Communication, and Collaboration: Assessment, Certification, and Promotion of 21st Century Skills for the Future of Work and Education. *Journal of Intelligence*, 11(3), 54–54. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence11030054>